

# THE EXPOSITORY TIMES.

---

## Notes of Recent Exposition.

WHAT was the Colossian heresy? Dr. Maurice JONES essays to tell us in his *Epistle of St. Paul to the Colossians* (S.P.C.K. ; 5s. net). Its chief promoters may not have been Jews, but there were decided Jewish elements in it. We gather this from the references to circumcision, to ritual and sumptuary legislation, and to holy days. Yet the enemies here are not those of the Judaistic controversy; the great key-words 'faith,' 'works,' 'righteousness' are absent, nor is there any indication that the Colossian heretics tried to impose circumcision on Gentile believers.

The principal elements, then, in the heresy were extra-Judaic. We gather that its code of morals was largely ascetic, dealt much in the 'don'ts' dear to the heart of the generation just before our own. 'Handle not, nor taste, nor touch.' The heretics, too, seem to have been a circle of the elect, laying claim to wisdom and insight beyond those of ordinary mortals, and basing their claim in part on visions.

The eclectic nature of the heresy was doubtless one of its attractions. The Hellenistic Jew found in it a religion that paid attention to the ceremonial law, in the matter of circumcision and the observance of feast days and Sabbaths. The cultured Greek would have a natural interest in a system which claimed to be not only a philosophy, but the

philosophy. For the Phrygian followers of the orgiastic cults of Attis and Cybele there were the 'delights of ecstasy and the privilege of mystic vision'; while the dabbler in Gnosticism would find himself at home with the æons and spiritual beings that filled the gulf between God and man.

In the Colossian heresy what place was given to Christ? It is not clear; but if we may assume that when Paul speaks of Christ in the Epistle he has the heresy in mind, it seems evident that these Colossians gave to Jesus a place in their religious thought very like that given by the modern Hindu reformers. For Jesus they have nothing but honour and reverence, but they have no sympathy with the unique claims that the Christian makes for Him. The Colossian estimate of Jesus was affected by their whole conception of angels, and it is in this conception that Dr. JONES finds the head and front of their heresy.

The birth and infancy narratives in Matthew and Luke are full of angels and visions. Our Lord believed in angels and referred to them repeatedly; but the plain truth seems to be that His communion with God was so immediate that in His practical life He found little or no place for angels. We cannot be too grateful that the Gospel narratives of His actual ministry so faithfully represent His



own attitude on this point. It might so easily have been otherwise.

To Jesus angels were not necessarily good angels. At least, if the Judgment scene in Mt 25 is a correct record of the words of Jesus, He conceived of the devil as having his retinue of angels. How does Paul stand in this matter? Dr. JONES suggests that Paul's eagerness to counter the Colossian 'angel' heresy tended to deflect his own views on angels; we may even say, led him to become himself a mild heretic on this subject. If Paul had been writing an academic essay on angels, no doubt he would have represented them as being on the whole on the side of God (we had almost said 'On the side of the angels'). But Paul's controversy with the Colossians unwittingly led him into a controversy with the angels.

But, after all, Paul's zeal against the Colossians was only one factor that led to his distrust of angels, which may have been more deep-seated than we are apt to think. Paul, following the apocalyptic scheme of the 'two ages,' repeatedly speaks of the pre-Christian world as being controlled by evil spiritual powers, 'the rulers of this world,' 'principalities and powers in the heavenly places.' It is true that he does not usually call these powers 'angels'; but in at least one passage (Ro 8<sup>38</sup>) he brackets angels with the powers of darkness that hinder the Christian's access to God.

And we can see how angels came to be suspect in the mind of Paul. According to a Jewish doctrine, elaborated from Dt 33<sup>2</sup>, angels had presided over the introduction of the Law, and were its guardians and the administrators of its decrees. But two interpretations might be placed on this function of angels. On the one hand we have Stephen's view (Ac 7<sup>53</sup>) that this mediation of angels added a new dignity to the Law. As against this we have the view of the writer to the Hebrews (2<sup>2</sup>), that the Law mediated by angels was inferior in dignity to the Gospel that came direct from the Son.

It is in this second light that Paul regards the matter. We see from Gal 3<sup>19</sup> that the part played by angels in the promulgation of the Law stamped it as to that extent an inferior agency. But Paul did not rest there. If Christ has freed us from the Law, He has freed us from the angels that controlled the Law. These angels apparently were to him the very principalities and powers that were dethroned in Jesus' death on the Cross (Col 2<sup>15</sup>).

In the wide sweep of the Apostle's thought (Col 1<sup>20</sup>) heavenly beings as well as earthly were reconciled when He made peace through the blood of His Cross. And so we reach the curious result, that angels not merely required to be, but actually were, included in the reconciliation secured by Jesus. So far had Paul been carried by the Judaic controversy and by the Colossian heresy from his earlier view, in which, like the Evangelists, he associated angels with the glory of Christ's Second Coming. If Paul's view on the subject has no other interest, it is at least a measure of his diagnosis of the danger of the situation created by the place given to angels in Colossian thought. Dr. JONES shows that, *mutatis mutandis*, the Colossian heresy is not so foreign or far-off to our generation as at first hearing it sounds.

The *Modern Churchman* for August contains an article on the Atonement by the Rev. Canon R. H. KENNETT, D.D., Regius Professor of Hebrew in the University of Cambridge. Dr. KENNETT is not going outside his own field when he writes on this doctrine, for he is mainly occupied with its roots in the Old Testament. Those who have followed Augustine's famous dictum, 'Novum testamentum in vetere latet; vetus testamentum in novo patet,' have approached the whole Bible with a prepossession towards a theory of the Atonement from which, in modern times, a healthy sense of justice instinctively recoils.

Before the days of Pentateuchal criticism it was impossible to understand that the first chapter of



Genesis was originally meant to supersede the second and third chapters; and accordingly the story of the Garden of Eden, literally understood, warped Christians' whole conception of God's relation to man. Because of the venial fault of one man millions were to be exposed to the risk of never-ending torture, and God was reduced to the necessity, while safeguarding His Divine prerogative by maintaining the letter of His arbitrary sentence, of seeking expedients to avert its most terrible effects. Nevertheless, God has relentlessly to cast off His children unless 'atonement' is made.

But what is atonement? In the Old Testament it does not necessarily imply expiation. It means *covering*; and denotes the covering over of what is offensive, or the covering over of the face of the injured person so that he may not see what is offensive. Read Gn 32<sup>20</sup>. Now in many passages of the Old Testament Jehovah is presented to us as an arbitrary oriental autocrat, and very naïve ways are employed to placate Him, to cover His face—sometimes arguments and sometimes sacrifices.

This is the idea which found expression in sacrifice, not expiation but the desire to conciliate God and make Him change His purpose. Very human emotions, and not always exalted ones, are attributed to Jehovah in some parts of the Old Testament. In the twenty-first chapter of 2 Samuel there is a terrible story of the demand made by the Gibeonites for the death of seven men of the family of Saul in revenge for a massacre of the Gibeonites ordered by Saul. This savage demand was acceded to because there was a curse upon the land and only in this way could it be removed. 'And after that' we read 'God was intreated for the land.'

Now the great prophets of the eighth and seventh centuries before Christ definitely repudiated this whole system of sacrifice as an ordinance of Jehovah. They demand nothing in the way of expiation for man's sin but only repentance and amendment.

And our Lord occupied the same standpoint. The whole of His teaching, so far from being merely the coping-stone of the sacrificial system, is the direct negation of it. He drew no illustration of His saving work from it. He never, so far as we know, took any part in it. In His dealings with sinners He never made any reference to it.

This does not mean that God is complacent or easy-going with sin or sinners. Repentance and the way back after repentance are hard. Also, it is to be remembered that the redemption of a soul is often possible only through the suffering, or martyrdom, of quite innocent persons. And it is in this sense Jesus has redeemed us. He gave His life that He might free us from the bondage of the fear of death and from the debasing superstition which arises from ignorance of the true character of God. If we have faith to believe the witness of Jesus about God we are at one with the Father. In the death of Jesus is the greatest proof of the love of God. And in vision of that truth we are saved 'by His blood.'

In *The Journal of Theological Studies* for the last quarter there was an article by the Rev. A. CALDECOTT, D.D., which may be taken as a pendant to Dr. KENNETT's on the 'Atonement,' but which has an interest of its own. The subject is 'The Significance of the "Cleansing of the Temple."'<sup>1</sup> There are two possible estimates of this event. Was it comparatively an unimportant event so far as influence on the development of the history goes? Or had it more importance than appears on the surface, exercising a decisive influence on the history of the closing week and on other matters also?

In *The Quest* of January, 1921 a learned Christian Jew, Dr. EISLER, argues strongly that the action of Jesus was in reality a decisive repudiation of the sacrificial system of Judaism, and Dr. CALDECOTT is inclined to this opinion also. He adduces in confirmation various facts. One is the marked way



in which the Sadducean officials of the Temple come to the front in the closing stage of opposition to Jesus.

Then there is the rapidity with which the officials were able to draw over to their side the multitude assembled in Jerusalem for the Passover, and to excite them to fury. 'Ah, thou that destroyest the Temple,' cried the mob. This hostility can hardly be accounted for by a mere protest against the profanation of the Temple. Can we account for it on any less hypothesis than an attack upon the sacrificial system itself?

What was the attitude of Jesus to the Blood-sacrifices before the last week? It is coming to be recognized that He must have been frequently in Jerusalem (Canon Scott Holland's recent book on St. John confirms this). Jesus must, then, either have approved the sacrifices by attendance at them or have avoided them. Which is true? Jesus discussed all kinds of religious questions—the Sabbath, Fasting, Divorce, the Resurrection—but He never mentions the sacrificial system at all except to quote with commendation Hosea's disparagement of it.

In the Church of the Apostolic period any regard for this system had completely disappeared. Could this have happened without some authoritative pronouncement from our Lord? That pronouncement would be before our eyes if we give the Cleansing of the Temple its maximum significance as a vehement protest against the continuation of the sacrifices themselves.

The attitude of the four evangelists to this incident is interesting, but the most interesting thing in this connexion is John's assigning it to the beginning of the ministry. Dr. CALDECOTT is convinced that there were two similar 'cleansings.' But they were similar only superficially. The first was a minor protest, and it attracted only slight attention. It attacked only minor abuses, and has therefore been correctly designated a

'cleansing.' It did not seem sufficiently important for the Synoptics to record.

But the second, radical and momentous, John found already recorded in its place. The first was to him simply an example of a quite early claim to authority on the part of our Lord. But having 'used this up' and given it its proper place, he omitted it in his account of the last week, though it was before him in the Synoptic tradition.

The argument in this article is suggestive and attractive. Objections to it are obvious enough, however. Why did Jesus say not a word on this occasion to indicate that He meant to strike at the sacrificial system? Is not the activity of the Sadducees at the end natural on the supposition that Jesus' whole teaching struck at their privileges and that He could not be condemned without their intervention? Is not the hostility of the people explained sufficiently by the discovery that Jesus refused to encourage their material ambitions? And, finally, is the indignation of Jesus not accounted for by the exploitation of the poor which He saw in this hateful traffic?

Men read from various motives, some unabashedly for pleasure, others to gratify curiosity, others to enlarge their knowledge, others to develop character. How many are there who regard reading as a religious obligation? Yet such seems to have been the view of Jesus.

Six or seven times in the Gospel of Matthew He confronts opponents with the question, 'Have ye not read?' When His disciples were accused of breaking the Sabbath by plucking ears of corn on that day, when the Pharisees cunningly requested Him to make a pronouncement on divorce, when the chief priests and the scribes manifested sore displeasure at the children who shouted Hosanna, when He pilloried His opponents in the parable of the husbandmen who slew the lord of the vineyard's son, when the Sadducees sought by a silly question



to cover Him and His faith in the Resurrection with ridicule—on all these occasions, and probably on many others of which we know nothing, He parried their malicious thrusts with the question, ‘Have ye not read?’

Reading is a duty, for the simple reason that no man is sufficient to himself. No man has a monopoly of wisdom, and the story of the past is full of inspiration and warning. If one has an opportunity of studying it, to ignore it is an act, at best, of thoughtlessness, and, at worst, of arrogance; it implies an intellectual self-satisfaction and a moral complacency which are the sure marks of an essentially shallow nature. The wisest of us cannot dispense with the garnered wisdom of the ages. It is partly because the lessons of the last seventy years have not been read, marked, and inwardly digested that the world presents the sorry spectacle that it does to-day.

But there is reading and reading. The opponents of Jesus were doubtless quite familiar with the passages to which He called their attention. They had read them many a time. But they had read them as ancient history, they had not seen how directly they bore upon their own life and conduct, they had not come under their searching and illuminating power, they had not submitted their souls to the wisdom which they enshrined. They knew them from memory, but not by heart, and so they did not know them in any vital sense at all. It is possible to read and to remain unilluminated, to gather from our reading no guidance for conduct, no wisdom or insight into the issues of life.

For if we look closely at these several challenges of our Lord, we see that the wicked stupidity of His opponents was largely due to their failure to understand the real meaning of the great words and the moving tales with which they must have been thoroughly familiar. Had the Pharisees truly understood the originality of ‘what David did,’ they would never have made themselves ridiculous by challenging the hungry disciples for plucking

the ears of corn on the Sabbath day. Had the Sadducees read the great words in Exodus, ‘I am the God of Abraham, of Isaac, and of Jacob,’ with minds enlightened to an appreciation of their immense religious potentiality, they would never have been so rash as to attempt to trip up Jesus with their almost comically improbable story about the woman with the seven husbands. Intelligent reading would have kept them from asking foolish questions, the answers to which left them looking ridiculous and discomfited. And what such reading might have done for them, it may do for us.

It is significant that the reading which Jesus presupposes in self-respecting people is the reading of the Bible. ‘Did ye never read in the *Scriptures*?’—the Old Testament Scriptures, of course. In Genesis, in Exodus, in Samuel, in the Psalms, and in many another book He found words of permanent wisdom; and still, as of old, the Bible is capable of being a lamp to the feet and a light to the path of those who read it. Not the smallest tragedy of our tragic modern world is the general ignorance of this incomparable Book. Professor PEAKE, in his Preface to Principal Mumford’s *Metrical Version of the Book of Job*, very truly speaks of ‘the widespread neglect of the Bible which is so ominous a feature of our time.’ Thousands of those who worship with more or less regularity in our Churches have not read what David did; they have only the most nebulous ideas of what Moses and Elijah did, or of what Amos and Isaiah and Paul and even Jesus said. And this failure to make the acquaintance of the great and daring ones of the olden time helps to explain the conventionality, the ineffectiveness, and the sterility of much of our religious life to-day.

It is also significant that Jesus should stress the biographical element in the Bible. Truth is most effective when it is ‘embodied in a tale,’ especially in the tale of a life which has left its mark for good upon the general life of the world. ‘Have ye not read *what David did*?’ What vistas of possibility this simple phrase opens out to the preacher! If, say once a month, he were to give us an inspiring



biographical study, to sketch the life and achievements and to lay bare the inward impelling motives of some of the saints, the missionaries, the preachers, the poets, the statesmen, the reformers, who have lifted humanity a little nearer to God ; if he were to tell us what David did, and Isaiah, and Paul ;

what Columba did, and Xavier, and Livingstone, and Mary Slessor ; what Savonarola did, and Luther, and Knox, and Calvin, and the Wesleys, and many another who wrought righteousness in his day and generation : how much fuller, richer, and more competent our own lives might be !

## Reality proved by Identity.

A STUDY IN EVIDENCE FOR THE HISTORICAL TRUTH OF THE GOSPELS.

BY THE REVEREND J. A. WOOD, M.A., LATELY CANON OF LAHORE.

IN all ages, from the days of Tatian in the second century to the present, a favourite problem has been the relationship of the four Evangelists to each other, and many have been the attempts to combine the four narratives into one continuous whole. Against all such endeavours has stood the opinion of those who have laid stress on the differences which mark off S. John from the Synoptists, a difference emphasized from an almost equally early age with Tatian's *Harmony* by Clement of Alexandria, who insisted on the spiritual character of the Fourth Gospel. The further the literary study of the Gospel proceeds, the more obvious it becomes that it is only by a most violent *tour de force* that the words of a mystic seer writing an appreciation, rather than a life, of His Master may be fitted and compacted, clause by clause, or even section by section into the daily chronicle, which fills the pages of the Synoptists. On the other hand, while the literary contrasts between S. John and the other Evangelists become more evident, there is an artistic agreement which demands an adequate explanation.

A portrait which is true to the original will enable us to recognize the features of the individual portrayed in other representations also. A crayon sketch by a master-hand will enable us to identify the likeness produced by any other competent artist in marble or in bronze, in oils or in water-colour. Suppose also that we have before us two representations of an ideal character, one in bronze and another in oils, with an entirely different pose in each, and yet that we can trace an exact correspondence feature for feature between the two, we shall without hesitation say that these are both from the same

living model. Such correspondence is impossible in works of imagination.

In this paper I propose to apply a similar test to the portraits of our Lord drawn in the Synoptists and in S. John. If on a close examination we find that these portraits drawn in such different media, and so often, from their difference of style, declared incapable of combination, are in fifty points feature for feature identical, then it would seem a not unfair deduction that they are both drawn from life.

The method proposed is independent of the appeal to evidence as to the existence of the Gospels in the first century. It takes the Gospel narratives as they exist to-day, and says : ' Granting that these portraits may in some degree have been retouched by other hands than the original artists', yet because, while obviously independent, they correspond in the minutest detail they cannot be works of imagination, representing only their authors' conceptions of a Divine Man, but must have been drawn from one living original.'

The argument I here outline has grown out of a study made some years ago of the human features of our Lord's character. To be truly man, our Lord must have possessed an individuality of His own, just as He had physical characteristics by which He could be recognized. That individuality was no mere colourless average of human dispositions, but was one with many and varied features fully developed. Pursuing this study, I noted more than fifty features of interest and noted all the references in which I found each trait of character to be exhibited. I started naturally with the Synoptists ; but, when I came to S. John, I found, as my



reading proceeded, that I was on the track of what in natural science we call a law. On page after page on which a reference from the Synoptists had been entered, references to S. John followed, and what was more, no new pages were begun, till a final review left each page headed 'S. J.', indicating that it contained references from both the Synoptists and S. John illustrating some particular feature of our Lord's character.

The study occupied my personal devotional reading for some ten months, and the force of the emergent argument is cumulative and not deductive, so that I must ask my reader's forbearance if its presentation has a certain sameness all the way through.

Naturally there was no obvious sequence in the characteristics as I noted them; and while I shall seek to present them under groups of headings, which may make their force more apparent, as in the physical region one might take in succession hair, eyes, nose, mouth, chin, in comparing two portraits, such grouping has no real effect upon the argument, and is only meant to assist the reader's patience in bearing with what would ordinarily be a somewhat monotonous reiteration. The main headings are six: I. Quiet Strength; II. Gracious Attractiveness; III. Vigour and Authority; IV. Submission and Service; V. Wisdom and Knowledge; VI. a brief miscellaneous section.

#### I. QUIET STRENGTH—

(a) which does not yield to demands for full explanation nor offer such when it might be expected: e.g. answer to John Baptist, 'Suffer it now,' etc. (Mt 3<sup>15</sup>); 'What I do thou knowest not now,' etc. (Jn 13<sup>7</sup>). Cf. also repeated refusals to work signs (Mt 12<sup>39</sup> 16<sup>4</sup> etc., and Jn 2<sup>18</sup> 4<sup>48</sup> 6<sup>26</sup> 30); cf. also Mt 21<sup>27</sup>, Lk 13<sup>23</sup>, Jn 7<sup>8</sup>.

(b) which does not shrink from immediate danger: e.g. 'Ye know that after two days the passover cometh, and the Son of man is delivered up to be crucified' (Mt 26<sup>2</sup>); 'Is not this he whom they seek to kill? and, lo, he speaketh openly' (Jn 7<sup>26</sup> 27); cf. also Mk 8<sup>31</sup> 9<sup>31</sup>, Mt 17<sup>12</sup>, Jn 11<sup>8</sup> 18<sup>4</sup>.

(c) nor the bearing of hardships: 'fasted forty days and forty nights' (Mt 4<sup>2</sup>); 'wearied with his journey' (Jn 4<sup>6</sup>); 'The Son of man hath not where to lay his head' (Lk 9<sup>58</sup> etc.); but it is not stoic indifference: no water, no kiss, no oil (Lk 7<sup>44-46</sup>); 'I thirst' (Jn 19<sup>28</sup>).

(d) is shown in the tender severity which exacts the confession from the woman with the issue (Mk

5<sup>30-34</sup>; cf. Lk 9<sup>41</sup> 24<sup>25</sup>, Mk 16<sup>14</sup>); and puts the three-fold question to him who had thrice denied (Jn 21<sup>15</sup> 16<sup>17</sup>; cf. Jn 13<sup>8</sup> 20<sup>29</sup>).

(e) is shown in the courage which takes the risks of the correctness of a diagnosis: refuses to allow healed Gadarene to go with Him (Mk 5<sup>19</sup>); bids Peter walk on water (Mt 14<sup>29</sup>); the command *Go* to the nobleman, who had begged Him to *come* (Jn 4<sup>48-50</sup>; cf. Mt 8<sup>20</sup> 15<sup>23</sup>, Mk 6<sup>48</sup>, and Jn 6<sup>5</sup> 11<sup>6</sup>).

(f) is shown in His industry: 'He went about all the cities and the villages teaching, preaching, and healing' (Mt 9<sup>35</sup>); 'As he was wont, he taught them again' (Mk 10<sup>1</sup>; cf. Mk 12<sup>1</sup> 23<sup>4</sup> 6<sup>2</sup> 6. 34 12<sup>35</sup> 14<sup>49</sup>). Compare with the double ending to S. John's Gospel, Jn 20<sup>30</sup>, 'Many other signs . . . not written in this book,' and 21<sup>25</sup>, 'Many other things . . . the which if they should be written . . . the world . . . would not contain the books.'

(g) is shown in the courage of retreat, as opposed to blind obstinacy: *He withdrew* after healing the withered hand when the Pharisees take counsel to destroy Him (Mt 12<sup>15</sup>); after hearing of the death of John Baptist (14<sup>13</sup>); after the visit of those sent to inquire why His disciples transgressed the tradition of the elders (Mt 15<sup>21</sup>). He would not walk in Judea because the Jews sought to kill Him (Jn 7<sup>1</sup>); went away beyond Jordan (Jn 10<sup>39</sup> 40); walked no more openly, but departed thence into the country near the wilderness (Jn 11<sup>54</sup>; cf. also Jn 4<sup>1-3</sup> 8<sup>59</sup> 12<sup>36</sup>).

(h) is shown in His silences: before the Council (Mt 26<sup>63</sup>), before Pilate (Mt 27<sup>12</sup> 14), before Herod (Lk 23<sup>9</sup>); so also Jn 19<sup>9</sup> Jesus gave him (Pilate) no answer.

(j) in His withdrawals when requested to go or when refused (Mt 8<sup>34</sup> 9<sup>1</sup>); 'he sighed deeply in his spirit . . . and he left them' (Mk 8<sup>12</sup> 13); so also His withdrawal from Jerusalem to Galilee (Jn 4<sup>43</sup>).

(k) is shown in avoidance of publicity: charged Jairus, etc., much that no man should know this (Mk 5<sup>43</sup>); cf. also 12<sup>5</sup> 44 3<sup>12</sup> 7<sup>36</sup> 8<sup>26</sup> 9<sup>30</sup> and Jn 5<sup>13</sup>, 'Jesus conveyed himself away, a multitude being in that place'; also Jn 7<sup>10</sup> 12<sup>36</sup>.

(l) is shown in His veiling of His message from those unfitted to receive it: 'Therefore speak I unto them in parables' (Mt 13<sup>13</sup>, Mk 4<sup>12</sup>, Lk 8<sup>10</sup>); cf. also Lk 22<sup>26</sup> 38, and in Jn 2<sup>19</sup> 22, 'Destroy this temple,' and the conversation with Nicodemus and the woman of Samaria; cf. also Jn 7<sup>34</sup> 10<sup>6</sup> 13<sup>26</sup> 36 21<sup>22</sup>.

#### II. HIS GRACIOUS ATTRACTIVENESS.

(a) In favour with God and man (Lk 2<sup>52</sup>), all



wonder at His words of grace (Lk 4<sup>22</sup>), while in S. John we have 'full of grace and truth' (1<sup>14</sup>; cf. 1<sup>16-17</sup>). He teaches in their synagogues, 'being glorified of all' (Lk 4<sup>15</sup>). Those sent to apprehend Him confess 'never man so spake' (Jn 7<sup>46</sup>); His touch of healing—the leper (Lk 5<sup>13</sup>), Malchus' ear (Lk 22<sup>51</sup>), the man born blind (Jn 9<sup>6</sup>).

(b) He associates freely with all men, with publicans and sinners (Lk 15<sup>1</sup>, Mt 9<sup>10</sup>); He came eating and drinking (Mt 11<sup>19</sup>), with Pharisees (Lk 11<sup>37</sup> 14<sup>1</sup>); and in S. John He asks drink of a Samaritan woman (Jn 4<sup>7</sup>).

(c) But this general graciousness did not mean that He was indifferent and treated all on an equality. He called His disciples and He chose from them (Mk 3<sup>13</sup>, Lk 6<sup>13</sup>); 'he suffered no man to follow him save Peter and James and John' (Mk 5<sup>37</sup>; cf. Mt 17<sup>1</sup>). In S. John we have 'the disciple whom Jesus loved' (Jn 13<sup>23</sup> 19<sup>26</sup> 20<sup>2</sup> 21<sup>20</sup>), and read 'Jesus loved Martha, and her sister, and Lazarus' (Jn 11<sup>5</sup>); while the thought of the Twelve leaving Him, brings out the question, 'Would ye also go away?' (Jn 6<sup>67</sup>).

(d) The battle over the Sabbath question was largely a struggle between a sweet reasonableness on Jesus' side and an impossible literalness on the other; cf. among many passages, Mt 12<sup>7</sup>, Lk 14<sup>5</sup>, and Jn 9<sup>14</sup>. This sweet reasonableness sought to avoid making others stumble: 'Cast a hook,' etc. (Mt 17<sup>27</sup>), 'Forbid him not' (Mk 9<sup>39</sup>), and 'Doth this cause you to stumble?' (Jn 6<sup>61</sup>).

(e) His encouragement to those in distress. 'Be of good cheer' is often on His lips. To the sick of the palsy (Mt 9<sup>2</sup>); to the woman with the issue (9<sup>22</sup>); cf. also Mt 14<sup>27</sup> and Jn 16<sup>33</sup>, 'Be of good cheer; I have overcome the world.'

(f) His wide compassion (Mt 14<sup>14, 16</sup>), His healing of many (Mk 1<sup>34</sup>), and *passim*, and particularly for women's tears (Lk 23<sup>28</sup>), and then in S. John, 'When Jesus saw her weeping, he groaned in the spirit, and was troubled' (Jn 11<sup>33, 35</sup>); 'Woman, why weepest thou?' (Jn 20<sup>15</sup>); cf. also Jn 20<sup>17</sup> 21<sup>5</sup>.

(g) His belief in the infinite value of human personality and His pains not to weaken it. This is illustrated by the question which brings to the surface the true personality in the man possessed with the legion, and in the refusal to allow him to remain by His deliverer's side (Mk 5, Lk 8), and the questions to bring into consciousness the implicit faith of the blind men (Mt 9<sup>28</sup>). So in S. John we have similar questions in 5<sup>6</sup>, 'Wouldest thou be

made whole?' in 9<sup>35</sup> to the man born blind, and in 11<sup>26</sup> to Martha; cf. also 1<sup>38</sup>.

(h) With this last characteristic we may associate His respect for the sanctities of home. He will not make the raising of Jairus' daughter a public show (Mk 5<sup>37</sup>, Lk 8<sup>51</sup>); He gives the healed lunatic boy back to his father (Lk 9<sup>42</sup>), and the widow's son to his mother (Lk 7<sup>15</sup>). Compare His whole teaching on Marriage and Divorce (Mt 5<sup>32</sup> 19<sup>4-9</sup>, Mk 10<sup>5-12</sup>) and then S. John's selection of the first miracle at the Marriage in Cana, and the remark, 'Go, call thy husband' (Jn 4<sup>16</sup>).

(i) He recognizes social courtesies or the lack of them. He marked how they chose out the chief seats (Lk 14<sup>7ff.</sup>); 'Thou gavest me no water, no kiss,' etc. (Lk 7<sup>44-46</sup>); cf. in S. John, 'Ye ought also to wash one another's feet' (Jn 13<sup>14</sup>); 'Come and break your fast' (Jn 21<sup>12</sup>).

(k) He champions the cause of the weak and of children, moved with indignation when disciples rebuke those that bring them (Mt 19<sup>13-15</sup>, Mk 10<sup>13</sup>, Lk 18<sup>15-16</sup>); cf. also Mk 9<sup>37, 42</sup>, Mt 10<sup>42</sup>. In S. John the last commands have to do with feeding His lambs (Jn 21<sup>15</sup>), while at His own arrest He shelters His own, 'If therefore ye seek me, let these go their way' (Jn 18<sup>8</sup>).

(l) Grief over men's folly and obstinacy. He looked round about on them with anger, being grieved at the hardening of their hearts (Mk 3<sup>5</sup>); cf. Mk 8<sup>12</sup>, Lk 19<sup>41</sup> 13<sup>34</sup>, Mt 23<sup>37</sup>, Lk 23<sup>28</sup>; 'Ye will not come unto me that ye might have life' (Jn 5<sup>40</sup> and 4<sup>48</sup> 20<sup>29</sup>).

(m) The magnetic power, which secures personal devotion. To Levi: 'Follow me . . . he forsook all, rose up, and followed him' (Mt 9<sup>9</sup>, Mk 2<sup>14</sup>, Lk 5<sup>27</sup>); cf. 'Follow me' to Philip (Jn 1<sup>43</sup>); see also Mt 4<sup>19, 20</sup>, Mk 1<sup>17, 18</sup>, Mt 4<sup>21, 22</sup>, Mk 1<sup>20</sup>; 'Rabbi, where abidest thou? Come and ye shall see. They came therefore and saw . . . and abode' (Jn 1<sup>38, 39</sup>).

(n) His forgiveness of enemies: 'He touched his ear, and healed him' (Lk 22<sup>51</sup>); 'Father, forgive them, for they know not what they do' (Lk 23<sup>34</sup>); cf. 'If the world hateth you, ye know that it hath hated me before it hated you' (Jn 15<sup>18</sup>), together with 'I came to save the world' (Jn 12<sup>47</sup>); 'I give my flesh for the life of the world' (Jn 6<sup>51</sup>).

### III. VIGOUR AND AUTHORITY.

These qualities of quiet strength and gentle graciousness are, however, mixed with others of a sterner fibre, as the following instances will show, and the argument of this essay gains force from



the fact that without embarrassment both the Synoptists and S. John combine in their portraits such very diverse characteristics.

Consider, as distinct from (a) His gentle graciousness, *His strong appeal to the heroic instinct*: 'He that loveth his life loseth it; and he that hateth his life shall keep it unto life eternal' (Jn 12<sup>25</sup>), and compare this not only with its repetition in Mk 8<sup>35</sup>, Mt 10<sup>39</sup> 16<sup>25</sup>, Lk 9<sup>24</sup> 17<sup>33</sup>, but with the challenge concerning those that have made themselves eunuchs for the kingdom of heaven's sake, 'he that is able to receive it, let him receive it' (Mt 19<sup>12</sup>), and others in Mt 8<sup>22</sup>, Lk 9<sup>60</sup>, Mk 10<sup>21</sup>, Mt 19<sup>21</sup>, Lk 18<sup>22</sup>. Consider also how with His sweet attractiveness we have (b) also a power of *vigorous denunciation*: 'Woe unto thee, Chorazin! . . . Thou, Capernaum . . . shalt be brought down to Hades' (Lk 10<sup>13-15</sup>, Mt 11<sup>20-24</sup>); 'Ye offspring of vipers' (Mt 12<sup>34</sup> 23<sup>33</sup>, Mk 12<sup>38-40</sup>, Lk 20<sup>45-47</sup>); 'Ye are of your father the devil, and the lusts of your father ye will do' (Jn 8<sup>44</sup>); and cf. 8<sup>55</sup>.

This characteristic is so marked that we can hardly wonder the Sons of Thunder imagining themselves entirely justified in talking of calling fire from heaven (Lk 9<sup>54</sup>), nor that (if the Apocalypse be from the author of the Fourth Gospel) he should write of the wrath of the Lamb. This outward expression corresponds to inward feeling: (c) He is moved with *indignation* in His spirit (Jn 11<sup>33</sup>, 38 RVm); He looks round about with anger, being grieved at the hardening of men's hearts (Mk 3<sup>5</sup>).

(d) The note of *authority* is in His voice, His words, His attitude. He taught as one having authority and not as the scribes, in a way that caused astonishment (Mt 7<sup>29</sup>; cf. 13<sup>54</sup>, Mk 6<sup>2</sup>, Lk 4<sup>32</sup>); He will not suffer that authority to be questioned by those who prove themselves insincere, 'Neither tell I you by what authority I do these things' (Mk 11<sup>33</sup>, Mt 21<sup>27</sup>). And when we turn to S. John we have at the outset of His ministry a cleansing of the temple executed in a manner that makes the disciples remember that Ps 69<sup>9</sup> spoke of 'The zeal of thine house shall eat me up,' and it is for judgment that He has come into the world (Jn 9<sup>39</sup>); the Father gave Him authority to execute judgment (Jn 5<sup>27</sup>). In noting this characteristic I have omitted many minor passages dealing with the authoritative note, the constant word of power in miracles of healing to evil spirits (Mk 1<sup>34</sup>, Mt 8<sup>16</sup>, Lk 4<sup>41</sup>), to the elements of nature (Mk 4<sup>39</sup>, Mt 8<sup>26</sup>, Lk 8<sup>24</sup>), or in the circumstances of raising Lazarus

from the dead (Jn 11<sup>39</sup>, 43, 44). Both in the Synoptists and in S. John, Jesus is one who commands and expects and secures obedience.

But this note of authority (e) includes a willingness to *entrust authority to others*. He commissions the Twelve to have authority to cast out devils (Mk 3<sup>15</sup>). What things they bind on earth are to be bound in heaven (Mt 18<sup>18</sup>). The Twelve shall sit on thrones judging the twelve tribes (Mt 19<sup>28</sup>). And in S. John the same appears in its most absolute form in the complete identification of Himself with His disciples (Jn 3<sup>11</sup> 9<sup>4</sup>, 1 Jn 1<sup>3</sup>), and reaches its crowning point in 'Receive ye the Holy Ghost: whose soever sins ye forgive, they are forgiven' (Jn 20<sup>22</sup>, 23).

I turn back again to the note of authority to point out that alike in Synoptists and (f) S. John it extends to a *Final Judgment*. Heaven and earth are to pass away, but His words are not to pass away (Mt 24<sup>35</sup>). 'The word that I spake, the same shall judge him at the last day' (Jn 12<sup>48</sup>); 'Inasmuch as ye did it unto me . . . eternal life; inasmuch as ye did it not . . . eternal punishment' (Mt 25<sup>40-46</sup>); 'The hour cometh, in which all that are in the tombs shall hear his voice, and shall come forth . . . good . . . resurrection of life; ill . . . resurrection of judgment' (Jn 5<sup>28</sup>); cf. also Mk 8<sup>38</sup> and parallels, and Jn 5<sup>27</sup>.

Is it unreasonable to see a foreshadowing of this claim in (g) the *acuteness of His questions*: e.g. concerning Baptism of John (Mk 11<sup>29</sup> and parallels), see also Mk 2<sup>9</sup> 3<sup>23</sup> 9<sup>12</sup> 10<sup>18</sup> 12<sup>35</sup>; and then in S. John, 'Whence are we to buy bread? This he said to prove him' (Jn 6<sup>5</sup>, 6); cf. Jn 9<sup>35</sup> 18<sup>21</sup>, 23 21<sup>15</sup>, 16, 17? He was from the first to issue (h) a *challenge* (Mk 1<sup>44</sup>), where He sends the healed leper to the priests, or His claim in Jn 9<sup>39</sup>, 'For judgment am I come into the world; that they which see not may see, and that they which see may become blind.' In this challenge lay (j) a *claim to satisfy the longings of the hearts of men*: 'Come unto me, all ye that labour and are heavy laden, and I will give you rest' (Mt 11<sup>28</sup>); 'I am the bread of life: he that cometh to me shall not hunger; and he that believeth on me shall never thirst' (Jn 6<sup>35</sup>; cf. 4<sup>14</sup> 7<sup>37</sup> 8<sup>12</sup> etc.).

(k) And this relationship is contemplated as *universal*: this gospel is to be preached in the whole world (Mk 14<sup>9</sup>, Mt 26<sup>13</sup>). [Is not the woman commended not so much for her devotion, as for the insight of love which made her realize that if He



went to His death He should, as He said, rise again, and therefore the ointment would never be needed to preserve a dead body?] 'I am the light of the world' (Jn 8<sup>12</sup>; cf. Jn 6<sup>33</sup> 12<sup>47</sup> 17<sup>21</sup> etc.).

(l) And when we reach claims as august as this, we are but a step from those passages where Jesus claims a wholly *unique position*, not only *with regard* to men, but *to God*: 'No one knoweth the Son save the Father, neither doth any know the Father save the Son' (Mt 11<sup>27</sup>; cf. 26<sup>64</sup>); and then in Jn 16<sup>15</sup>, 'All things whatsoever the Father hath are mine'; cf. 9<sup>35</sup> 10<sup>36</sup> 14<sup>1</sup> 17<sup>5</sup> etc. And as a consequence he accepts (m) *unique titles of praise and worship*: 'Thou art the Christ the Son of the Living God' (Mk 8<sup>29</sup>, Mt 16<sup>16</sup>, Lk 9<sup>20</sup>); 'Dost thou believe on the Son of God? . . . He it is that speaketh with thee. And he said, Lord, I believe. And he worshipped him' (Jn 9<sup>35-38</sup>; cf. 11<sup>27</sup> 20<sup>28</sup>).

IV. Yet once more the prism may be turned, and He who is seen making such august claims is seen both in the appreciation of His character by S. John and in the simpler day by day record of the Synoptists to have a character in which SUBMISSION AND SERVICE have their place.

(a) 'The cup which the Father hath given me, shall I not drink it?' (Jn 18<sup>11</sup>); 'Not as I will, but as thou wilt' (Mt 26<sup>39</sup>). So also in the prayer at the grave of Lazarus, 'Father, I thank thee that thou heardest me' (Jn 11<sup>41</sup>), and in the reply that to sit on His right hand is not His but His Father's to give (Mt 20<sup>23</sup>, Mk 10<sup>40</sup>), the same note of submission is heard; cf. also the note of thanksgiving at the feeding of the multitude (Jn 6<sup>11</sup>, Mt 14<sup>19</sup> and parallels, as well as Jn 12<sup>28</sup> 17<sup>4</sup> 5<sup>30</sup>).

(b) With submission to God we may link that sense of a *foreordained path* indicated by the Scriptures: 'Behoved it not the Christ to suffer these things,' etc. (Lk 24<sup>26, 27</sup>); 'The Scripture cannot be broken' (Jn 10<sup>35</sup>); and also (c) His view of His life as one of *service to men*: 'The Son of Man came to minister' (Mk 10<sup>45</sup>, Mt 20<sup>28</sup>); 'I am in the midst of you as he that serveth' (Lk 22<sup>27</sup>), and in S. John we have the washing of the disciples' feet in Jn 13. At the same time this ideal of service on His own part (d) leaves Him *willing to accept service from others*. He can claim hospitality from Zaccheus (Lk 19<sup>5</sup>), and for the last passover (Mk 14<sup>14</sup>, Mt 26<sup>18</sup>), and in S. John, 'They made him a supper there, and Martha served' (Jn 12<sup>2</sup>). It would seem this was but the leaving room for the fulfilment by others of His own ideal. The (e) acceptance of respect did not

mean *acceptance of authority in the sense of this world's standard*: 'Man, who made me a judge?' (Lk 12<sup>14</sup>); 'Perceiving they were about to make him a king, he withdrew' (Jn 6<sup>15</sup>). He (f) *avoids flattery*: e.g. in conversation with Nicodemus He passes over the preliminary compliments (Jn 3<sup>2, 3</sup>), and to Good Master! the reply is, Why callest thou Me good? (Mk 10<sup>7, 8</sup>).

With this avoidance of flattery (g) we may link the *kindly irony* in which He takes refuge at moments of natural tension, 'Sleep on now' (Mt 26<sup>45</sup>); see also 26<sup>50, 53, 55</sup>, and His reproof of Nicodemus, 'Art thou the teacher of Israel, and understandest not these things?' (Jn 3<sup>10</sup>). But this section on Submission and Service cannot close without a reference to the large place (h) *Prayer* holds in His life both in the Synoptists and in S. John (Mk 1<sup>35</sup> 6<sup>46</sup>, Lk 5<sup>16</sup> 6<sup>12</sup> 9<sup>18, 28</sup> etc., Jn 11<sup>41</sup> 12<sup>28</sup> 17).

V. A fifth group of characteristics may be gathered up under a heading of WISDOM AND KNOWLEDGE.

(a) First the *practical wisdom* and tact which deals successfully *with crowds*. Before the distribution of food the crowd is to be seated (Jn 6<sup>10</sup> and Mk 6<sup>39</sup> and parallels), while on another occasion the little boat waits on Him (Mk 3<sup>9</sup>; cf. 4<sup>1</sup>), and at the raising of Lazarus it is the multitude that standeth by which is His concern (Jn 11<sup>42</sup>).

(b) It is a *swift penetration* that enables Him to recognize the snares hidden in His adversaries' questions (Mk 12<sup>13-34</sup>, Mt 22<sup>15-40</sup>, Lk 20<sup>20-38</sup>). He Himself knows what is in man (Jn 2<sup>25</sup> and 6<sup>26</sup> 6<sup>70</sup> 8<sup>7</sup>).

(c) He *impresses those who are hostile*: 'How knoweth this man letters?' (Jn 7<sup>15</sup>); 'Never man so spake' (Jn 7<sup>46</sup>); 'Whence hath this man this wisdom?' (Mk 6<sup>2</sup>, Mt 13<sup>54</sup>).

(d) And He gives Himself with particular diligence to the *training* of a carefully selected body (Mk 3<sup>13</sup>, Lk 6<sup>13</sup>, Mt 13<sup>36, 37</sup>), and practically the whole of the second half of S. John. With this insight into men we may group (e) an *insight into the future*. He knows from the beginning who it is that shall betray Him (Jn 6<sup>64</sup>). He knows the scattering of the disciples which is to come (Jn 16<sup>32</sup>); He knows the end of S. Peter (Jn 21<sup>18, 19</sup>); cf. also Jn 1<sup>51</sup> 4<sup>18</sup>, while in the Synoptists we have the directions as to making ready the Passover (Lk 22<sup>10-12</sup>, Mk 14<sup>13</sup>), the foretaste of the Kingdom which is to be given to some (Mk 9<sup>1</sup>, Lk 9<sup>27</sup>, Mt 16<sup>28</sup>); and this sweeps on into the future glory of His coming again (Mk 8<sup>38</sup>, Mt 16<sup>27</sup>, Lk 9<sup>26</sup>, and Mk 13, Lk 21, Mt 24, 25; the dead are to hear the voice of the Son



of Man and live, Jn 5<sup>25</sup>) and the *sublime consciousness* (f) of *ultimate victory* (Jn 12<sup>32</sup> 16<sup>33</sup> 6<sup>40</sup>, Lk 21<sup>33</sup> 22<sup>29</sup>).

There remain some four small points which I have not fitted into the five main groupings above, but which just because of their variety are the more worthy of inclusion.

(a) *Avoidance of waste*: 'Gather up the fragments' (Jn 6<sup>12</sup>, Mk 6<sup>43</sup> and parallels).

(b) *Capacity for surprise*: He marvelled at their unbelief (Mk 6<sup>6</sup>), and at the centurion's faith (Mt 8<sup>10</sup>, Lk 7<sup>9</sup>; so Mk 7<sup>18</sup> 8<sup>17</sup>, Lk 17<sup>17</sup>), and in S. John, 'Have I been so long time with you, and yet hast thou not known me, Philip?' (Jn 14<sup>8</sup>).

(c) *Capacity for joy*: 'My joy' (Jn 15<sup>11</sup> 17<sup>13</sup>); 'He rejoiced in the Holy Spirit' (Lk 10<sup>21</sup>).

(d) *His self-revelation*: The details of the Temptation must have been from Him (Mt 4, Lk 4); 'He manifested forth his glory' (Jn 2<sup>11</sup>).

(e) *His need of faith*: before He could display His powers, 'He could there do no mighty work . . . because of their unbelief' (Mk 6<sup>5</sup> etc.); and the question to Martha (Jn 11<sup>26</sup>).

In conclusion I would repeat what was said at the beginning, that the argument built on the discussion of these many traits in our Lord's character is independent of the suitability or otherwise of their classification. It is cumulative and not a chain of reasoning dependent on its weakest link, and I would submit that a case has been made out that a fourth author, working independently of three others who are interrelated, has produced a portrait so strikingly identical that we are shut up to the conclusion, that neither he nor they have given us an imaginary portrait but one drawn from life. The independent portraits demonstrate their reality by their identity.

## Literature.

### PSYCHOLOGY AND THE LIFE OF JESUS.

ONE of the most interesting and stimulating books that we have read for some time is *Some Aspects of the Life of Jesus*, by Mr. Georges Berguer of the University of Geneva, which has been excellently translated by Mr. and Mrs. Van Wyck Brooks (Williams & Norgate; 15s. net). Where ministers meet in a discussion-circle, we commend this book to their attention. They will find it full of 'meat,' full of suggestion, in many parts requiring an answer; which answer will tax all their dialectical skill to give. The author holds that merely historical criticism of the rise of the Church and the Gospel narratives is about played out. He does not despise its conclusions nor depreciate its value. The time has come, however, to begin investigation from the point of view of the New Psychology. We are greatly impressed with the author's humility. He acknowledges that reliable results are likely to emerge only after a large number of scholars have had time to study the various problems and correct one another. He approaches his great subject, too, in a most becoming attitude of reverence. The orthodox will not agree with his conclusions always or perhaps often, but we do not think that any of

them will be pained by any expression that they could designate irreverent. The ninety-two pages of introduction are exceedingly valuable, and will, we think, command general assent. It is important to know something of the atmosphere in which Christianity first arose, and the most important element in that atmosphere was the Mystery-religions with their soteriology, their sacraments, and many other resemblances to Christianity. Our author's account of the significance of those resemblances, and his indication of the vital difference of Christianity from all the Mystery-religions, strike us as eminently discerning and satisfying.

He then passes to a consideration of the evidences of the historicity of the personality of Jesus, in the course of which such writers as J. M. Robertson and Drews are subjected to what seems to us to be a final criticism. 'It remains true that a manifestation of character as personal as Christianity cannot be explained save as having at its base a creative personality which gave birth to it.'

Coming now to his main theme, the author explains that he has merely selected some aspects of the life of Jesus as unfolded in the Gospels. These, however, are the most important. He deals with the Birth; the Childhood and Youth; the Baptism



and Temptation; the Teaching; the Miracles; the Transfiguration; the Personality; the Death; the Resurrection.

As to the Birth-stories, he holds it proved that, viewed as history, the narratives contradict one another alike in the date, the place and the circumstances alleged. Admitting, however, that we have to do with legend, not history, he goes on to show that legend enshrines a deeper truth than mere historical fact. Here, it is obvious, are room and need for question and discussion. The same is true of the chapter on miracle, in which one may feel that the 'explaining away' is not very different from the old rationalism. Let us note in passing that two miracles frankly puzzle our author—the turning of water into wine, and the cursing of the fig-tree. Every chapter, however, will be found most suggestive and in part most provocative. We do not know that higher praise for a book is possible than just that.

#### THE LOVELIEST LIFE.

*The Loveliest Life* is the story of Jesus Christ retold for young people by Grace Winter (Pilgrim Press; 10s. 6d. net). It is an octavo volume bound in a dull maroon colour which will grow upon the little ones the more they see it; the paper is thick, the print large; there are a number of illustrations in colour from the paintings of William Hole, and others in sepia from the works of various modern painters. This is the outside, but what of the inside of the volume? We need not try to give an estimate of that, for it has been done already by Dr. Hastings. He read the MS. and wrote an introduction. 'It stands,' the publishers say, 'as one of those generous acts of which his life was full.' This was his considered opinion: 'This, then, is what I have found in the reading of it—simplicity of language which never descends to childishness, imaginative realization of the scenes and incidents of the Gospels which never passes into mere fancy, delightfully accurate scholarship which never loses its charm in pedantry, and above all else depth of love and most gracious loyalty to the Person of our Blessed Lord and Saviour. Let those who have tried it confess how difficult it is in writing the Life of Christ to be quite modern yet never bizarre. That difficulty has been completely overcome. And if it is still more difficult to be true to the humanity and the

divinity, and to both at once, not even there has the difficulty been insurmountable. The loving Lord is always the mighty God: He who stilled the tempest is quite naturally found tired with His journey and sitting "thus" at Jacob's well.

'One thing more. The whole story is told in this book. It is not a selection of striking incidents. Every incident is included. Nor is it a compilation of great sayings. Every word takes its place in the narrative; to which it gives and from which it receives the fuller significance. And not only is the whole story told, but every portion of it is told in sufficient detail to give it interest. The teacher or parent who uses the book will find that one of its short chapters makes an attractive Sunday afternoon reading. And the reading is likely to become a permanent factor in the training of the child.'

#### WITCH-BOUND AFRICA.

Mr. Frank H. Melland, B.A.(Oxon.), has written an admirable and authoritative book. But the first and last impression left upon the mind is the fineness of its author's spirit. Here is a man who has for long been a magistrate in Northern Rhodesia, and as he unconsciously photographs himself in these pages he is the exact type of being one would choose for such service, a man who loves the natives and who, recognizing that both officials and missionaries are apt to get a one-sided view of things, has taken infinite pains to understand them, though he confesses, with a humility that makes one trust him, that he is still unsure concerning many things. This is a wise and just and catholic mind that sees clearly the difference we are all apt to forget between our own conventions and the eternal moral principles, that knows this is a big world and that every people has its own contribution to make, not least the African native. It is a very vivid picture, drawn with materials from uncontaminated sources, that he paints us of their life and thought and customs, and especially religion. Upon the last the author is particularly informing. He objects to the word 'heathen,' or at least to the loose way in which we fling it about, declaring that the native as he knows him is a deeply religious man, with his whole life permeated by such things; he is indignant at glib charges of immorality, and shows the immense difficulty, and sometimes the unwisdom, of forcing



the native into certain ways imperative for us, but to his conscience just unclean. 'Even a native wouldn't do that,' we say; but he has heard the natives crying out in horror, 'Even a white man wouldn't do that!' To them many of our customs are as obviously and uglily immoral—the marriage of first cousins, for example, if the children of two sisters—as many of theirs are to us. Yet Mr. Melland has no illusions, draws a fearsome picture of the infant mortality, some sixty per cent. or more, and wonders indignantly why it is only occasional horrors that call out our humanitarianism for folk in Moscow and the like, when this dreadful evil, always there within our own Empire, leaves us cold. *In Witch-Bound Africa* (Seeley, Service; 21s. net) becomes more and more fascinating as it wades deeper into its subject. On witchcraft it will just have to be studied. Very telling is the accumulated evidence that after all the natives are only two hundred and fifty years behind us, very sobering the author's confession that there are things which he does not believe or disbelieve, very weird and creepy his stories of dreadful beings, invisible save to their owners, three feet high, with protruding bellies and heads turned the wrong way, who suck out the breath of their owners' enemies through a hollow grass; or of snakes with their owner's face who murder for him, or of two-headed creatures who slay people by eating their shadows, or the inveterate belief in a dreadful pterodactyl. Mr. Melland seems quite confident that within recent times that prehistoric bird has existed in Rhodesia. On totems and divination and the like there is much here of vital interest. The whole closes with a paper read to a Conference of missionaries on the future of the native, wise and shrewd, and full of common sense, and very loyal to the faith. Mr. Melland wished his book to be a serious study, which it certainly is, yet to be readable by any one. And there, too, he has succeeded.

#### THE CHURCH AND HER CLAIM.

Two books have recently appeared which deal in different ways with the same problem: Why should men go to church? What claim has the Christian Church on them? And, especially, what claim has she on those who are uncertain of the truth of her message? It is the problem dealt with in *Can I be a Christian?* by the Rev. James O. Hannay (Hodder & Stoughton; 5s. net). It is also

the problem in view in *Students and the Church*, the Report of a Commission appointed by the General Committee of the Student Christian Movement (S.C.M.; 1s. 6d. net).

The Rev. James O. Hannay is better known as 'George A. Birmingham,' and by his entertaining novels, than as the author of 'The Spirit and Origin of Christian Monasticism.' And indeed, though G. A. Birmingham is not mentioned anywhere in this book, it is his voice that is heard in it. The writer deals with his theme in a series of letters addressed to a friend who has a very loose connexion with the Church and wonders whether he ought to have any. He can't believe in the Resurrection of the Body, and is hazy about more important things. Mr. Hannay thinks that he ought still to go to church, and in these letters tells him why. They are the letters of what may be called a Christian man of the world. There is nothing startlingly heretical in them, but they take a broad view of the relation of creed to life. It is more important to be a Christian than to believe in the Resurrection of the Body, and to be a Christian is to have the spirit of Christ. Creeds are just signposts marking the course of the Church's development. The gravest problem to-day is not faith in the creed, but faith in the life Christ calls us to live. Is it desirable? Is it an ideal for us? And is it liveable? No one can get anything but good from the reading of these generous and broad interpretations of real Christianity. They are a little thin, but this is probably the kind of argument that appeals to the person in view.

The Student Christian Movement book is a much more thorough affair. The thing to be said about it at once is that it is an essay on loyalty to the Church. The questions it discusses are: Why should students attend church, be members of the Church, and (particularly) enter its ministry? In answering these questions the book goes to the root of the matter and asks what the Church *is*. And so the essay develops into a discussion of the whole subject under these heads. (1) The Nature and Purpose of the Church; (2) the Worship of the Church; (3) the Thought of the Church; (4) the Service of the Church; (5) Students and the Ministry of the Church. Every one of these points is handled with ability, thoroughness, and complete frankness. The weaknesses of the Church are admitted as freely as Mr. Hannay admits them, but the claims of the Church on the loyalty and service of the new



generation are put on an unassailable basis, and we can imagine few things better for candid youth than to have this book put into its hands. Mr. Hannay's friend, also, might do worse than buy a copy and supplement his confessor's counsel by something a little more complete.

### LORD GUTHRIE.

'My experience has been that the happiest people I have ever known, the people who seemed to get the most out of life in all its varied aspects, have been the most religious people, to whatever sect they belonged.' This is the testimony we find in the most interesting and revealing *Life of Lord Guthrie* (Hodder & Stoughton; 10s. 6d. net), compiled by Sheriff Robert Low Orr, K.C., himself a distinguished member of the Scottish Bar. We are told that when Lord Guthrie reached seventy he meant to retire and to write his reminiscences. It was a delightful anticipation never to be realized. Fortunately Sheriff Orr has succeeded in this Memoir in giving us a speaking likeness of a Scotsman of the very best type, a man in earnest in all he did, and at the same time gifted with a keen yet genial humour in his outlook on life.

To his own countrymen Lord Guthrie needs no introduction. In the roll of honour of the distinguished sons of the Scottish Manse his name will always stand high. He was one of the youngest of a family of eleven. 'There are two things,' he said, in a speech in Glasgow, 'connected with the Presbyterian manses which have often amazed me. The first is how . . . with such meagre incomes and so many claims our ministers manage honourably to pay their way. The second is perhaps not surprising at all—how the children of the manse, piously brought up, frugally reared, inheriting an honourable name, and fighting their own battles, attain positions of usefulness and eminence at home and abroad in every walk of life, altogether out of proportion to their numbers.'

Charles Guthrie's choice of a profession was the Scottish Bar. That he was his famous father's son brought him briefs, but his own gifts as a pleader at the Bar brought him a speedy success. He was not only a total abstainer but an ardent advocate of temperance, and this he was warned would ruin his chances. He held on his course nevertheless, and never regretted it. In his earlier career he had two hobbies—one the determination

to present to his countrymen a portrait of the real John Knox, and the other to redeem them from the curse of intemperance. His recreations were foreign travel and the Boys' Brigade. In the latter he took a great interest.

Lord Guthrie was an ardent advocate of Church union in Scotland just because religion was to him the greatest interest in life, and even thirty years ago he liked to picture what Scotland might become under such a union. In all this diversified record of a most active life Sheriff Orr has done what few writers of such a Memoir have been able to do; he has kept his subject entirely in the picture and himself in the background.

---

*Light from Ancient Letters*, by Rev. Henry G. Meecham, M.A., B.D. (Allen & Unwin; 7s. 6d. net). Much spade work was necessary to unearth the papyri, and much spade work of another kind is needed to find what light they throw on the language, structure, and thought of the New Testament; and even when this work is done, there still remains the task of making this knowledge available for the general reading public. Much of the pioneering and popularizing work has already been accomplished. Our grammars, lexicons, and commentaries have been or are being brought up to date; important selections from the papyri are available in handy form; and we have more than one excellent introduction to this fascinating field of study. There was room, however, for a book which would show us in detail, but not with too great profusion of detail, just what additions the papyri have made to our knowledge in the different departments of New Testament study. This is the task Mr. Meecham has carried through. For good reasons he limits himself to the Oxyrhynchus papyri of the first four centuries, and among these, to private letters. After some account of the nature and extent of this correspondence, numerous points in New Testament vocabulary, grammar, and orthography are illustrated by quotations from the letters; the distinction between a letter and an epistle is shown, and the question is then discussed what light the papyri shed on the form and phraseology of the New Testament Epistles. The author of this new and useful introduction to the study of the papyri owes his initiation into the subject to the late Dr. James H. Moulton.



*Sparks from the Fire*, by Mr. Gilbert Thomas (Chapman & Hall; 6s. net), is on the whole a book for a tired mind in the evening or for a railway journey. Indeed one visualizes Mr. Thomas as a chatty fellow-traveller, with an interesting face and kindly, on occasion humorous, eyes, yet with a certain doggedness about his jaw that shows at times, who has dropped into the opposite seat, and now and then breaks into talk. Sometimes he hasn't much to say yet says it pleasantly, sometimes he is shrewd and observant, sometimes he moves with ease among the deeps. His eyes, one notices, cannot pass a child; but almost anything will start him off—a cigarette picture, stamps, the railway lines. Now and then one has the suspicion that he is almost talking nonsense, as we all do at times; and he has odd bits in his mind, as we all have. Yet he whiles away the journey, and one can always break in with a rejoinder where one differs, though Mr. Thomas pays no heed but ripples on. These little essays make easy reading, but much art lies behind their even flow. The paper on Shelley is a thing by itself; it, too, is not long, yet it is not a little essay but a singularly brilliant study of that most elusive mind, written with all the subtlety of an exquisite sympathy, a paper that has its own place in the memory even after Francis Thompson. There are poems also scattered here and there throughout the book, like that in which the author movingly sums up that pacifism which is the passion of his life.

Messrs. T. & T. Clark have published for the Trustees of Mrs. Honyman Gillespie a large and handsome volume by the late Mr. William Honyman Gillespie, F.R.G.S., *The Necessary Existence of God* (6s. net). It is the fifth of a series of books by the same author, all introduced and explained by Mr. James Urquhart, F.S.A. (Scot.). Gillespie, as is well known, was, in a former generation, the protagonist of the *a priori* proof for the existence of God. He gave his life to this task, with singular devotion and with considerable intellectual powers. His sole object was to convince men by clear logical demonstration that God is, and must necessarily be. The whole point of his many books was that the existence of God is as clearly demonstrable as that the three inside angles of a triangle are equal to two right angles. This *a priori* argument does not appeal to the present generation, for obvious reasons. For the time at least we have passed

away from that point of view. But the *a priori* argument may come into its own again, and in such a contingency Gillespie may have to be considered. The present volume has a carefully-worded introduction by Professor H. R. Mackintosh, who also supplies an addendum, giving the views of modern philosophers on the nature of space.

Nothing in the whole of the mysterious East is more bewildering to the Western mind than the thought and worship that have gathered around Siva. For that grim and dreadful figure, almost repulsive as it often seems to us, has aroused an ardour of affection not easily matched. The Saivite philosophy is held by some, with a good right to speak, to be the deepest and noblest product of Indian thought. The Saivite religion has called forth an exuberance of hymns unmatched outside of Christianity and the Psalms for sheer spirituality and joyous consecration, and not a few Saivite saints have sung their way to a religion startling for its lofty purity and contempt of idolatry. How such a conception of God has produced such results may be for the West a perennial puzzle, but of the fact there is no question. In recent times a little band of Saivite scholars have been striving to extend their faith. Among them is Mr. D. Gopaul Chetty, a firm believer in the Saiva Siddhanta or Tamil philosophy. One day a contributor sent in to his magazine, the 'New Reformer,' a contribution upon Swedenborg. The editor was immediately and vastly impressed by the parallel between this teaching, new to him, and Saivite thought. And prolonged study has made the similarities seem even more remarkable to him and has convinced him that it is through Swedenborg that the true line of advance lies for himself and many of his countrymen. 'The favour that I got,' he says, quoting a Tamil poet, 'I must show to the world.' *New Light upon the Philosophy of India* (Dent; 3s. 6d. net) is the result. The author seems to have lost hope of his own native philosophy attracting his countrymen; he declares that the Reformed and the Roman Churches are making 'no impression upon any thinking man in India'; but he sees light at last. 'The spiritual conquest of India by Christ will take place through the teaching of Swedenborg'; and his whole soul cries out for an intensive campaign to begin at once.

A volume of Sermons by Dr. Lynn Harold Hough



has just been published by the Epworth Press (3s. 6d. net). Dr. Hough was Professor of Historical Theology in Garrett Biblical Institute for some years. He then became President of the North Western University. But, deciding to go back to pastoral work, he resigned the presidency, and is now in charge of the Central Church in Detroit. The title of the volume is taken from the second sermon, *The Renaissance of Religion*. At different times, when the tide of Christianity has ebbed, Dr. Hough shows that there has been a definite renaissance in religion, and so to-day he looks confidently for another renaissance of religion. It will come, he says, when Christian people make use of their resources, for he sees there are multitudes of quiet people who cherish the fire of God in their hearts. It is this wealth of moral and spiritual certainty which has to be made articulate. When it becomes articulate it becomes contagious. He sees a great creative renewal of the inner life coming, and this new life within will mean a new life without. 'The social programme must be seized and revitalized, and made effective and triumphant by those who bring to it the resources of a vital contact with the Saviour of the world.' There are twelve sermons in the volume, each containing one idea which is well worked out and stimulates thought.

A thorough and well-informed account of Christian Science was very much needed, and it has been supplied by the Rev. J. Moffat Logan in *Christian Science Expounded and Exposed* (Kingsgate Press; 2s. 6d. net). The title is unfortunate, for professed 'exposures' are often prejudiced and ill-founded. But Mr. Logan's book is neither. He has been collecting material for many years, he has all the literature on both sides at his finger-ends, and he writes with quite unusual ability. The story he tells is extraordinarily interesting, especially the detailed personal history of Mrs. Eddy. But the chapters on the philosophy of Christian Science, its development into a church, its pretensions and its fruits, are nearly as absorbing. It is not necessary to expound the nature and claims of this movement here. It will be sufficient to say that if any one wishes to know its history, its real nature, and its worth, he could not do better than go to Mr. Logan's able and enlightening book.

The Rev. S. C. Carpenter, B.D., Vicar of Bolton, has written a book which is as fascinating and

suggestive as it is able and scholarly. Its title is *A Large Room: A Plea for a More Inclusive Christianity* (Longmans; 6s. net). The thesis of the book is that there are three essential elements in Christianity, which are rightly named Catholic, Evangelical, and Liberal, and that the present-day Christian ought to have room in his religion for all three elements. This is not the 'breadth' of the man to whom no opinion is vital because none is more true than another. Mr. Carpenter believes whole-heartedly in the Catholic position; he is intensely evangelical; and in his views of Scripture he is thoroughly 'advanced.' Eight of his chapters are devoted to an exposition of the three elements named, and the exposition of each in turn will satisfy its warmest adherents. This is followed by the application of the inclusive Christianity thus delineated to some of the problems of the day, such as Comparative Religion, Politics, and Christianity and Reunion. There is a remarkable chapter, bold and yet sensible, on 'Some Experiments,' in which the writer deals with such subjects as the ministry of women and other thorny matters. The whole book is refreshing and enlightening. The kind of Christianity it presents, not emasculated or in any sense negative, but positive and inclusive, is the religion which will conquer the modern mind. It is the religion of the New Testament.

*The Emphasized New Testament*, by the late Mr. Joseph Bryant Rotherham (Sampson Low; 7s. 6d. net), has reached a fifth edition, indicating that it has met a real demand. It has manifestly been a labour of love to the author. He gives us his own translation, which aims at being a literal rendering of the Greek, based on the Westcott and Hort Text. Generally, though not quite always, it succeeds in being English as well as a translation of the Greek. Important variant readings are mentioned, and in the Gospels the references to the parallels are given. Narrative is distinguishable at a glance from speech, the beginnings of new sections are so arranged as to be obvious, Old Testament quotations are printed in italics, while there are numerous Biblical references. A useful feature is a fairly wide margin for readers' notes and jottings.

The book gets its title from a series of symbols which indicate the precise stress of voice to be given to each word or phrase. Presumably there are readers who desire elocutionary assistance of



this kind ; though it is not quite easy to see how it is compatible with the other aim of giving a literal translation. We can see the grammatical reasons which led the author to give such renderings as : ' At midnight an outcry hath been made ' ; ' Father ! Give me the share that falleth to me of what there is ' ; ' Although with the tongues of men I be speaking and of messengers ' ; ' Ye wives, be submitting yourselves unto your husbands.' But would any one care to read such translations in public with whatever emphasis or want of emphasis ?

That the number seven is common in Scripture every schoolboy knows. That the sacred number, however, lurks in the most unexpected places of Holy Writ, that indeed it enters into the very structure of the volume, it has been left to Mr. R. M'Cormack to reveal in *The Heptadic Structure of Scripture* (Marshall Brothers ; 12s. 6d. net). Wonderful as his discoveries of sevens are, his inferences are still more amazing. Let us mention two by way of illustration. The Bible contains forty-nine books, if we take the reckoning current when the last portion of it was written, or sixty-six books if each be counted separately. The latter number shows that outwardly it is a human book, coming to us in human dress ; the former, in which seven is emphatically contained but not seen, denotes that it is nothing less than the Word of God. Again, who wrote 2 Peter ? It must have been the author of 1 Peter, for, by considering a large number of words common to both Epistles, we find that while the number of their occurrences in each Epistle by itself will not divide exactly by seven, the sum of their occurrences in both Epistles does so. The book is a monument of patient and almost incredible toil. As to the profit of it, for either writer or reader, opinions will differ.

Alternate pages of letterpress and of photographs make up an attractive volume, to which the alliterative title *Petra, Perea, Phœnicia* (Marshall Brothers ; 7s. 6d. net) has been given. The author is the Rev. A. Forder, who already has several volumes on Palestinian life to his credit. He shows himself keenly alive to natural beauty, both in plants and in rocks, and is possessed of the art of vivid description. His book is popular in more senses than one, and scholars, while indebted to him for his adventurous spirit and his first-hand information, gained at considerable hazard, will receive with a measure

of reserve his attitude towards Scripture. In the fate of several ancient cities he sees ' a literal fulfilment of prophecy, demonstrating the unchanging character of sacred writ.' Confidence is shaken by the mention of ' muzzebahs' (*sic*), equated to ' images' or ' groves.' He adds : ' The Revised Version has substituted the word " obelisk " for " image " or " grove," which makes the meaning simpler.' But it is not quite so simple as that, even according to RV.

The spelling of proper names is not orthodox, as the following instances show : Nabathean, Khuznee (Khazneh), Medaba, Callirhoe, Caeserea, Baalbe(c)k, Zarepeth, Ramases.

Bacchus is twice referred to as *goddess* of drink and pleasure. At another point Aaron's death is said to be followed by his *internment*.

In spite of this it may be said that the hope of the author in his Foreword has been realized : some measure of pleasure and profit has been given and gained.

Messrs. Stanley Martin & Co. have sent three small books for review, being volumes two, three, and four of their ' Pilgrim Library of Scripture Exposition and Christian Literature.' Two of the volumes are by the late Rev. James Neil, M.A.—*Peeps into Palestine* (2s. 6d.) and *Our Great High Priest* (2s. 6d.). The third is a volume of Sermons by the Rev. H. Tydeman Chilvers, Pastor of the Metropolitan Tabernacle. The sermons were preached there on Thursday evenings. The texts chosen are questions addressed to our Lord. The title of the volume is "*But Jesus Answered.*"

We noticed a few months ago an edition of *Hymns of the Kingdom*. Now a larger harmonized edition has been issued, containing both staff and sol-fa notations (Milford ; 4s. 6d. net). *Hymns of the Kingdom* is the English section of ' A Student's Hymnal.'

' I hold that a sound working knowledge of Scripture is the surest antidote to modern superstition and fanaticism.' So says Mr. T. H. Darlow, who has just retired from the post of literary superintendent of the British and Foreign Bible Society. Mr. Darlow uses every means for spreading this knowledge of Scripture. One of his latest methods is by setting Bible problems in a daily newspaper, and giving the answer to them a few



days later. A volume containing a number of these problems has been issued by Messrs. Morgan & Scott (2s. net)—*1001 Bible Problems*. The thousandth problem is, 'Where does the phrase "Breach of Promise" occur in Scripture?' and the thousand and first, 'Which prophet alludes to people having clean teeth?'

*The Divinity of Christ in the New Testament*, by Mr. J. Herbert Williams (Murray; 5s. net) is a book on heresy. In previous publications Mr. Williams has dealt with various heresies: disallowing the office and dignity of the mother of Jesus, holding erroneous views on eternal punishment and on inspiration. The heretics he has in view in this book seem to have two characteristics. On the one hand, they accept the authority of the letter of Scripture; on the other, they do not believe in the Divinity of Jesus. One would have thought the number who fulfil both conditions would be small; but the author considers them sufficiently important to be reasoned with. His task, then, is to show that the Divinity of Jesus is taught directly or indirectly in the New Testament.

He believes he is breaking new ground inasmuch as he is studying not the facts but only the records. He makes this claim in the preface, and that he is quite serious in making it is shown by his treatment of the Resurrection narrative. He knows that Unitarians and others believe this narrative to be 'later addition, hallucination, unconscious embellishment.' Nevertheless he believes that his argument is not affected. The only question is: What did the Evangelists narrate? What does the record say? Few will contest Mr. Williams' claim to be a pioneer in this method of Biblical study.

Philippians 2<sup>6</sup> he translates—'Christ Jesus, existing in the form of God, thought it no robbery that he should be equal to God.' Two specimens of his exegetical method will suffice. At the presentation in the Temple, the prophetess Anna is said by St. Luke (2<sup>38</sup>) to have confessed to the Lord (*sic*) and spoken of Him to all who looked for redemption in Israel. Obviously it was the babe she was speaking of, and presumably the babe was also the Lord. The writer goes on to equate the 'Lord' with God.

In his account of the birth of Jesus, St. Matthew quotes Isaiah's prophecy: 'They shall call his name Emmanuel,' that is, 'God-with-us.' But Jesus was not called 'Emmanuel.' The passage

must mean—'Jesus shall *be* Emmanuel, that is, shall be God.'

The Synoptists omit the narrative of the miracle at Cana, 'probably owing to the Blessed Virgin being concerned in it.' The author hints that if we do not accept his exegesis of the crucial passages, it is because we are prejudiced against the doctrine of the Divinity of Jesus. The book is written with much earnestness, and the author may be right in thinking that there are those whose faith will be strengthened by discussions of this kind.

Professor A. C. Welch, D.D., describes his *Translation of the Book of Jeremiah into Colloquial English* (National Adult School; 1s. 3d. net) as 'a humble effort to represent Jeremiah's meaning more correctly.' It is certainly a valuable effort; into this inexpensive little volume Professor Welch has compressed a large amount of minute and thoughtful study. No bare translation of any Hebrew prophet can ever be entirely satisfactory, and this is in reality more than a translation. It is prefaced by a brief but suggestive introduction, and the various oracles are all introduced by appropriate descriptive titles which let us into the secret of the passage and sometimes expand into historical and even critical comments. Professor Welch is too good a scholar to be dogmatic amid so much textual uncertainty, and his comments are marked by refreshing candour. He will tell us, *e.g.*, of a verse which he omits, that he can neither translate nor understand it; of another, that he has no idea what it means, and that he does not pretend to know whether Jeremiah wrote it. Everywhere we see the caution of the true expert, and from this volume the ordinary reader will get a good idea of the almost insuperable difficulties that not infrequently beset the translation and interpretation of the Old Testament.

The translation is thoroughly modern: 'evil way' becomes 'bad conduct,' 'elders of the land' becomes 'country Sheikhs'; and, as a longer specimen, let us quote 36<sup>23</sup>, which runs: 'When Jehudi had read three or four pages, the king slashed them with a pen-knife and tossed them into the fire in the brazier, until the entire scroll was finished.' Familiar phrases are transformed in ways that will set the reader thinking: *e.g.* 17<sup>9</sup> becomes, 'the mind of man is more secretive than all else and is set on evil; who can fathom it?' In a second edition, a note might profitably be added



to r<sup>11f</sup>. in explanation of the vision of the almond-twig, which no translation by itself can make fully intelligible. Much of the beauty and cadence of Jeremiah's poetry is necessarily lost in a prose translation, and it would be particularly unfair to expect these things in a translation which, in terms of the series to which it belongs, is frankly 'colloquial'; but there is genuine compensation in the easy and natural quality of the style. This is a real contribution to a much more intelligent appreciation of the message and the personality of Jeremiah than is possible on the basis of the Authorized, or even of the Revised, Version.

The National Sunday School Union has published a number of pretty stories by Mary Entwistle. She calls the book *Children of Other Lands* (2s. 6d. net). The stories were written in the first place for kindergarten teachers, so that they might retell them to children here.

It is a considerable number of years now since Mrs. Dyer wrote an account of the work in India of *Pandita Ramabai*. The earlier life was largely rewritten, and in its revised form it went through a number of editions. After the death of Pandita Ramabai it was again revised, and it has now been reissued (Pickering & Inglis; 4s.).

In 1892 the Religious Tract Society published *Ten Years' Digging in Egypt, 1881-1891*, by W. M. Flinders Petrie (6s.). Now a volume from the same publishers bearing the same title has appeared, but cover and title-page show Sir W. M. Flinders Petrie, and the price has been reduced to 3s. net. Perusal of this work has evoked a desire to learn the sequel of such digging since 1891, in the same popular form, and also to know whether in the interval of fully thirty years the distinguished Egyptologist has been led to modify his views in any particular. To take one instance, it has been questioned (by Steindorff) whether Daphnæ (the subject of chapter iv.) is identical with the Biblical Tahpanhes; and even where the equation is allowed it is reckoned to be barely worth while to try to prove the identity of the fortress, still known as the 'Castle of the Jew's Daughter,' with Jeremiah's 'House of Pharaoh' (Peet).

The Religious Tract Society have issued the first four series of Mrs. Gatty's *Parables from Nature*, at

6s. net. The volume contains a number of illustrations.

It is encouraging to find Roman Catholic scholars entering the theological fray on equal terms with all others and striking shrewd blows for the *status quo*. *The Gospels—Fact, Myth, or Legend?* is by a scholar of the Roman persuasion, J. P. Arendzen, Ph.D., D.D., and M.A. of Cambridge (Sands & Co.). It is a popular defence of the historical trustworthiness of the Gospels. The author knows the literature and quotes Burkitt and Harnack. He also draws obviously upon others whom he does not name. The book is intended for the average educated person and aims at making the Gospels credible to him. This aim is directly sustained in the first half of the book by a series of studies on 'The Credibility of the Gospels,' and in the second half indirectly by interesting chapters on 'New Testament Times.' The book is 'popular,' but for that reason is just the kind of argument that will appeal to the non-specialist layman. Were it not for the Appendix on 'The Use of the Bible in the Catholic Church,' the impression of the whole book would be one of breadth. But the Appendix is an amazingly obscurantist performance. The Scriptures, it seems, are a superfluity. The Church did not need them, but in the 'excess of His bounty' God gave them as an additional help in the Church's service. And so on. Cut out this Appendix and you have a good specimen of popular apologetic.

An account of the Christian Sadhu *Sundar Singh* has been written for young people, and published by the Society for Promoting Christian Knowledge (2s. net). It has been written jointly by E. Sanders and the Rev. Ethelred Judah, B.A., the S.P.G. missionary in charge of Patna.

Miss Annie H. Small has written for the Student Christian Movement a book on the Third Gospel, *The Kingdom and the King according to Luke* (4s. net). It is not a book for scholars or theologians, though there are few of either class who will not learn much from it. It is professedly intended for people who have little leisure for study, and its aim is to make them acquainted with St. Luke's picture of Jesus, and with his underlying ideas in their present-day applications. There are three divisions of the book—'In Silentio et in Spe,' 'The



Mission of Jesus,' and 'The Great Symbols.' These symbols, which sum up Luke's account of the Gospel, are the Manger, the Cross, the Empty Tomb and the Common Meal. In each division there are sections and sub-sections, and the plan in each sub-section is to give first a selection of passages from the Gospel, then brief comments in numbered paragraphs, and, finally, suggestions for 'thought and prayer.' It will be seen that the method is broadly that made familiar in the Fosdick books. And this study is quite as original and suggestive as any of these. In point of fact the value of the book lies just in this, that it contains a fresh and informing reading of the ministry of Jesus. And, whether he be scholar, theologian, or unlearned layman, the reader will find much in this book to enlighten and inspire him. Surely, however, the author is rather belated in her critical attitude when she dates Mark A.D. 70 and Luke still later.

The Student Christian Movement continues its good work of commending religion and the Bible to circles far beyond its own. One of its latest services is the volume on *The Making and Meaning of the Bible*, by George Barclay, M.A. (4s. net; in paper covers, 2s. 6d. net). Mr. Barclay deals with both Testaments, selecting from the Old Testament for special treatment the historical books, the early chapters of Genesis, the Prophets and the Book of Jonah, and from the New the Synoptic Gospels and the Fourth Gospel, the Epistles coming in for more cursory treatment. The treatment, as one would expect in a small volume of one hundred and sixty-eight pages, is sketchy and elementary, but for that reason it is all the better fitted to enlighten those to whom the modern attitude to the Bible is unfamiliar. Difficulties are fairly met, and perplexed minds are given valuable guidance as to the true approach to the Bible.

---

## A Sermon.

BY PROFESSOR W. M. MACGREGOR, D.D., GLASGOW.

'Blessed are they who hunger and thirst after righteousness; for they shall be filled.'—Mt 5<sup>6</sup>.

HERE is a text which must always be unwelcome to any indolence of nature, for in speaking of effort and ambition and frustration it actually calls these blessed. Our Lord in His Beatitudes raises the familiar question—Who is the fortunate and the enviable man? And His answer is startling, for He lays His hand on the poor, the troubled, the often disappointed, and declares that these are the really fortunate. It is a paradox, of course, but we must not blunt its point; for He intended by its sharpness to penetrate the thick protecting skin of our settled prejudice.

I do not need to say that there is a great deal of hungering which has no touch of blessedness. When a man is back from a day on the hills he may congratulate himself on being so gloriously hungry, for hunger then is his friend and lends a flavour to all that he eats. But it discovers a very different quality in shipwreck or in siege, where hunger appears as one of the most appalling of human distresses; and when we widen our use of the word and talk of the hunger for companionship, or kindness, or success, the grimness still continues.

Everywhere we find men like ourselves enduring this sickness of hope deferred. They wish and long, and they never see. They search in vain for any look of friendship in the wilderness of faces on the street; and such a hunger grows to be a wasting fever in the blood, of which it would be cruelty to say that it brings blessedness. Indeed hunger, in almost any sense, appears so little blessed that people everywhere are toiling to exclude it from their lives. 'All the labour of a man is for his mouth,' says the Preacher—just to keep him from ever being hungry.

Then is the Master's word mere paradox? or is there some true sense in which, looking and looking again, we may find that He is right?

1. For one thing, it is surely true that there are things in the world which it is good to hunger for even if we never get them in possession. Leonardo da Vinci said of his own calling—'A painter who has the misfortune to be satisfied with himself has mistaken his vocation; whilst he who is never satisfied has at least a chance of becoming an admirable workman.' There, in the language of another craft, Christ's judgment is repeated. A



painter may have the *misfortune* of being satisfied with himself—that is only the other side of Christ's declaration that he who is never satisfied but always dreams of a better than the best he has attained, he is a fortunate man.

One of my old University teachers in Philosophy—Professor Campbell Fraser—had the amiable fashion of congratulating his students on their privilege in entering his class ; and yet what was there he could offer ? At best, I suppose, a search for truth, in which there were bound to be disappointments and delays. The seeker would often blunder up some blind alley, from which he could only escape by confessing that he had gone wrong. But when all is said, that search is still a worthy quest, in which a man of noble heart would rather fail than succeed in many another direction. He confesses that he will not ever get the truth entire within his grasp, but at least the hope and the desire of it are always with him. He will not allow that 'a bird in the hand is worth two in the bush,' for a bird in the hand is one whose song has ceased—a poor prize after all. But the truth which constantly outgoes me—that makes me rich though I never lay my hands upon it. An artist is not sorry for his pupils though they have to strive a hundred times to bring upon their canvas dreams and radiances which have visited them ; certainly they fail, but their failure is a vital part of their success. They come short because they aim so high ; and meanwhile, in their failure, they are keeping company with beauty itself, aiming at it and following it and engaging their faculty with it. They hunger and thirst after it, and thus they are truly to be envied.

And the same is true of goodness, said Jesus ; and many who have fallen hopelessly in love with it would add their witness to His. They are never satisfied, always they find something to condemn, and yet they go on trying. No doubt it is disappointing to make so little progress ; but since first they saw what goodness is like their heart has been drawn out after it. Humbly confessing that they are not the men they ought to be, they stubbornly hold on to hope ; and in spite of many defeats they would not choose another life than this in which goodness is the prize. Thus they keep company even in their dreams and desires with the highest, and Jesus, who knew men, pronounced them blessed. They do not as yet enjoy the comfort of attainment, and mislikers on every side may be quick to proclaim their shortcomings ; but

there is a glory even in their failure, and the Master has said that they shall not always fail.

It is obvious that such a life is possible only in a spacious world, which many people never enter. In most of us there is a root of laziness, inclining us to rest in what, with least of toil, we can secure ; and many, if they had their way, would lie upon their backs subsisting on such fruits as fall within their reach. Their chief authentic scripture is the saying which represents it as a curse for a man to eat his bread in sweat of brow. But that curse was long ago discovered to be a blessing in disguise, and the races which now seem most to be pitied are those which have been most screened from the necessity of toil. Certainly this was the Master's estimate. He had no praise for such as are content with what they have attained, but only for those who claim a share in the ampler things beyond. They may not reach them now, but how amazingly good it is to try ! These are My friends, He said, and I count them blessed.

2. The other thing to note is the unwavering confidence of Jesus that such longings shall one day be satisfied. 'The soul will long after something,' says Matthew Henry, 'and those who fasten upon the right object, which is satisfying and not deceiving, are indeed blessed.'

This confidence of Jesus had many aspects. For one thing, it was bound up with His *absolute belief in prayer*. Emerson tells of an unlettered field labourer in New England : 'He was a Methodist, and, though ignorant and rude, he had some deep thoughts ; and one day he said to me in the field that men were always praying and that all prayers were granted. I meditated much on his saying, and wrote my first sermon upon it.' Now that faith of the New England ploughman, that men are always praying and that all prayers are granted, lived in the heart of Jesus, and it made Him bold in His prediction here. Those who hunger after righteousness shall be filled, He said ; for their hunger, whether it finds utterance in word or not, is a prayer. The restlessness and disappointment and self-upbraiding of men rise up to God, and Paul daringly affirms that the Spirit takes these groanings of ours and offers them to God as a plea. A man's nearest friend may not know what he is after, sometimes he himself hardly knows, but God understands, says Paul. 'That which drew from out the boundless deep turns



again home.' There are few things, even in the Gospels, more rebuking than our Master's conviction that prayer is inevitably heard. Without any 'if' or exception He declared that if we ask we *shall* receive; and since our hunger is a prayer it cannot but be answered, said the Lord.

No one need imagine that the seeking therefore is needless, or that the object would have come to us without our importunity. No hunger, no satisfaction: that is the rule to which our Lord appeals. In a gold-bearing region two men may tramp up a glen together, one for mere pastime, whilst the other is on the outlook for paying gold; but it is the second who detects the trace of colour in the gravel. Two men are roaming in the Highlands, one a Cockney, letting his mind lie fallow, the other on the hunt for songs and lilts; and it is he who catches the vague cradle song the granny is crooning, and reckons it a prize. The man who has hunger and the man who has none may be encompassed by identical opportunities, but the reward is for the first. Two shall be working in the field, said Jesus, but one is left outside; two shall be grinding at the mill, two sitting in the pew, two joined in the marriage bond, but always it is the seeker, the hungry, who attains. It is not enough to have a vague goodwill to goodness, the whole mind must be made up; for it is the hungry who break the husk and enjoy the kernel, who grapple with the deeper meanings of the promise, and explore the hidden graces of the sacrament.

God does not stint His creatures, only they must ask; and if the door be shut, they must knock and go on knocking. The need for effort never passes, but still the promise stands—'Ask, and ye shall receive'; and those who hunger after righteousness shall, without fail, be filled.

And Jesus was sure of what He said, *because He believed in God and in the world as made by God*. Some of us look with sombre and discouraged eyes on life as if there were something cynical in it—marsh lights to lure us on to the morass and then forsake us. But in Jesus' view God's world is fundamentally just; there is a reward for all labour, and God renders to every man according to his work. In patches of the field the soil is shallow, and in others it has not been rightly cleaned, and thus the crop is uneven; but over the whole surface of the field the one energy of life is at work. Where it cannot produce much, at least it tries to produce; and even in the stony ground there is

forthwith some sign of growth. Do not be afraid, said Jesus, that this noble appetite in you will lead only to disappointment; do not try to content it with something less than bread, and above all things do not seek in manifold distractions to forget about it. A man's desire for righteousness is the noblest part of him, and God who awakened it will not deny it satisfaction. 'Thou wouldst not have sought Me,' He said to Pascal, 'if thou hadst not already found Me.' The longing and the discontent are the best of signs, for it is God in you who accounts for them. It is He who sends the 'mighty famine,' under whose compulsion the son at last says, 'I will arise, and go to my Father.' And he finds satisfaction there.

And Jesus was sure of His promise, *because He was sure of Himself and His power of helping men*. As the promise comes from Him it can be judged of only in His presence, though we all are slow to do justice to the difference which Christ has made. The Old Testament keeps record of extraordinary achievements of faith, but mixed with these there is a story of misapprehension and of groping. I suppose there was bound to be when no one visibly stood at the back of the promises on which men had laid hold, to guarantee their fulfilment. They had leaped up to God—these undiscouraged heroes of faith; but often it seemed as if no hand were outstretched to welcome them. But now the Christ has come, and all the promises of God take on another look. This is what makes the New Testament the most buoyant and radiant book that ever was written, for the Lord of life and light and healing inhabits every page of it. The Apostles felt that, after ages of desire and longing, the day had come for satisfaction; and to all the hungry souls in the world of their time they carried the good news that in Jesus Christ the promises of God were assured.

I fear that many of us are Old Testament believers still, looking to God and in some vague sense trusting God, but always without a Saviour and the glad assurance which He made possible. But this, and every Beatitude, has Jesus Christ as its sole ground. He is nothing else than God's hand reached out to help us through; He is God's mercy now with hands and feet; and thus through Him things long impossible are brought to pass. The man who has received Christ Jesus in his heart will still be hungering, but he will not be famished; for the Father who knows our need will in this thing also give us day by day our daily bread.



## In the Footsteps of John Lightfoot.

BY PROFESSOR GUSTAF DALMAN, D.THEOL., GREIFSWALD.

WHEN John Lightfoot's *Horae Hebraicae et Talmudicae* were edited (1684) in Germany by J. B. Carpzov, this was done, firstly, in the conviction that Jesus in His intercourse with the Jews made use of the language of the Talmud, and that, therefore, this language could help to a better understanding of His words; secondly, because the righteousness of the opponents of Jesus had to be illustrated from their own sentences; and thirdly, because many geographical, historical, and ritual points in the Gospels could be explained only by the aid of Rabbinical literature. Carpzov, as one of the defenders of Lutheran orthodoxy, meant to give faith a sound basis in philological and historical accuracy by making the work of the admired scholar of Canterbury accessible to German students. That his effort was not in vain is shown by the eagerness of German science to follow in the footsteps of Lightfoot. Meuschen, Scheid, Danz, Schöttgen, and others hastened to use Rabbinical wisdom for the explanation of the New Testament; and Schöttgen, who dedicated his *Horae Hebraicae et Talmudicae* to God and the Church, confessed in his Preface: 'Nisi Lightfootus lyrasset, multi non saltassent.' The arguments used for such studies at that time have not lost their power even to-day, though the question of the language of Jesus can no longer be solved by general hints at Talmudical language or simple 'parallels' between the words of Jesus and the sentences of the Rabbis, but has to go into the details of different dialects whose grammar, vocabulary, and phraseology are still imperfectly known.

But the most important problem, not yet touched by Lightfoot and his successors, is the personality of Jesus Himself—the question how far He was a Jew, where we see God revealed in Him to mankind, at a certain definite stage of history, but with a view to all coming ages, and how He became what He desired to be and finally was to Jews and non-Jews. *From Letter to Spirit* has to become the watchword, as Edwin A. Abbott rightly demanded in his 'Attempt to reach through varying voices the Abiding Word' (1903). How is this high aim to be reached? Certainly not without the most unsparing labour. It is a matter of regret

and difficult to understand that at no theological school in the world is there any Foundation entrusted with the special duty of such scientific work from a Christian point of view. We have some more or less able amateurs in Jewish science, but where are the authorities acknowledged by Jewish scholars as their equals? Any one who imagines that knowledge of Judaism can be acquired by the way does not know the complex nature of its sources and the imperfection of the existing apparatus. The syntax and the vocabulary of the dialects in question have to a great extent still to be written. The text of the Talmuds and the Midrashim is still in disorder and not even divided into small portions adapted for citation. For the Law the Jews have created compendia and indexes; for theology this has still to be done. One who is not thoroughly at home in this literature and its language makes constant blunders, as even Jews know, since real Talmudical scholars of their own have become rare, and their studies can no longer be concentrated on Rabbinical literature. Thus preliminary work on texts and languages cannot be spared. My own Grammar and Dictionary were attempts, I hope, in the right direction. But such work must be continued and completed.

A second kind of preliminary work concerns the investigation of Rabbinical literature and theology as a science in itself, without the one-sidedness of a selection from a special point of view; and, I think, scientific work, even with a Christian aim, cannot be done otherwise. When such work has been done, coincidences and differences between Judaism and Christianity, between the Rabbis and Jesus, have to be made clear. And here collections of parallels from both sides, like Lightfoot's *Horae Hebraicae et Talmudicae*, will be a good help, saving the time of the professional scholar and providing materials otherwise inaccessible to others. If these parallels are well selected and reliable as regards translation and exegesis, they mean valuable work, and should be widely used, not as an ass's bridge, but as helps to the acquirement of deeper knowledge. Just now, to the humiliation of professional scholars, the admirable work of a simple country clergyman, Paul Billerbeck, now



D.D. of Greifswald, edited by the late Professor Strack, surpasses in extent and intrinsic value all that has been done before in this direction. I mean the *Kommentar zum Neuen Testament aus Talmud und Midrasch*, von Hermann L. Strack and Paul Billerbeck (München: C. H. Beck'sche Verlagsbuchhandlung). Only the first volume (Matthew, 1055 pages, in quarto) has appeared. The second volume is in print; the completion of the remaining two volumes, already prepared by the author, will depend upon the interest shown in the work by the purchase of the early volumes. We are glad to say that the assistance of friends, including some in Scotland and England, has facilitated the printing of those first two volumes. It is hoped that the completion of the work will be possible before its venerable author, now seventy years old, is taken away.

When the materials are collected, the real work in question can begin. Even here it will be profitable to do this work in different stages. There is the linguistic department, to which C. F. Burney's useful book on *The Aramaic Origin of the Fourth Gospel* (1922), together with A. Schlatter's *Die Sprache und Heimat des vierten Evangelisten* (1902), belong. Another department is the comparison of particular theological notions on both sides. My *Words of Jesus*, vol. i., belongs to this category.

A third department concerns the investigation of the words of Jesus as they are found in the Gospels, to find out how they may have been expressed in their original language and what they would then have meant to a Jewish hearer. My own *Jesus-Jesua* (1922) is a small contribution in this direction, wrongly understood by those who expect final and definite results from this kind of work and naturally feel disappointed when such do not appear. Conclusions are possible only when, after the literary work is ended, the historical task begins; and the work of all departments (the comparison of Jewish Theology is only one of them, side by side with the investigation of the Greek Gospels and their notions as understood by Hellenists) has to be concentrated on one final effort.

At all stages of the work we should not neglect the study of what Jews have done, and are still doing, it may be, to confirm their own religious position. Adolph Büchler's *Types of Jewish Palestinian Piety from 70 B.C.E. to 70 C.E.* (1922) is important in this direction. But the character of a

Jewish standard work on Jesus must be attributed to Josef Klausner's Hebrew book, *Jēshū han-nōšrī, zemānō, hayyāw wetōrātō* ('Jesus the Nazarene, His Time, His Life, and His Doctrine'). This work of 468 pages (royal 8vo) appeared in Jerusalem in 1922, and may be procured by applying to the author, Dr. J. Klausner, Jerusalem, Bucharijah. Dr. Klausner was, without doubt, well equipped for his work, having written in German on *Die jüdische Messianologie im Zeitalter der Propheten* (Krakau, 1908), and—with Hebrew title—on 'The Messianology in the Apocrypha and Pseudepigrapha' (Jerusalem, 1921). To give an impression of the contents and tendency of his new book, I may report what it says on the Crucifixion of Christ. This most cruel, and to our author detestable, method of execution was originally Roman, not Jewish; and there is no doubt, he says, that Jesus did not deserve it, as He was no rebel against Roman power and no blasphemer or seducer to idolatry according to Rabbinical definition of these crimes. But political calculations and superficiality on the part of the Sadducean and Roman judges made His condemnation and execution possible. Flagellation was part of the Roman process of execution. The crowning with thorns would be an invention of the executioners to mock the Jews and their king, but is perhaps not historical. [Here the author defines the thorns which may have been used, as *Gundelia Tournefortii*, referring to my *Orte und Wege Jesu*, p. 210. But there that kind of thorn is mentioned as unfit for the purpose, while the claim of *Carthamus glaucus* (Heb. *ḵōš*) might be considered.] As to the site of Golgotha, Dr. Klausner prefers that contended for by General Gordon (to whom he ascribes a motive which was not his) to my vindication of the traditional site ('naturally on account of pure traditionalism'), without making clear where the walls of Jerusalem were at that time. The words of Jesus to the women of Jerusalem and His prayer for the executioners do not suit, we are told, the dreadful situation, and are reported only by Luke. The distribution of clothes, the abuse of the Crucified, His words to the dying robber, were invented to supply a fulfilment of the words of Ps 22 and Is 53. The *titulus crucis* proves that Jesus really was crucified as a Jewish Messiah, not as an apocalyptic prophet as some would have it. That Jesus died on the Cross in shorter time than usual is explicable by His bodily and mental sufferings. That the Father did not come to rescue His Son, He could

not understand. Jesus' prayer from Ps 22 is quite natural, and would not have been invented. Luke substituted for this another utterance, which could not be used in opposition to Christian beliefs. John suppressed the words because they did not suit the Logos. For the disciples of Jesus their dream of the Messianic kingdom was at an end. There is nothing to be said against the story of the interment by Joseph in his own sepulchre, as time was short on the eve of the Sabbath, and Jesus could not be regarded as executed by a Jewish tribunal. 'Here at the locked-up tomb'—with these words the author closes this chapter—the

story of Jesus ends, and the story of Nazarenism begins.'

There is nothing in the above representation of the Crucifixion of Jesus which strikes one as new. But it shows how necessary and how important is the work at whose service Jewish literature should be placed. That Jesus is the Messiah of God not only for Israel, but for all men, and in what way He is so, is what we shall have to show. Even tedious labour, if any earnest labour can be tedious, is a privilege, if undertaken for this end. May John Lightfoot find many followers until the aim is realized.

## Recent Foreign Theology.

### German Theology.

At last we have what was badly needed—a scholarly report on the present position of investigation into Calvin's theology.<sup>1</sup> Works on that subject having become too numerous for all but specialists, Bauke has worked over the literature and explains in detail what has been done, and by whom, and what yet remains to do. The result is excellent. The author rightly decides that Calvin's theology is not explicable from a single principle. Some reason there must be for the wholly antagonistic verdicts passed on it by Reformed and Lutheran thinkers, and Bauke inclines to suppose that a German, being a monist, can never quite get inside Calvin, who was French and a pluralist; and contradictions which Germans find in his thought were to him no contradictions at all. Bauke turns for explanation to three essential points: (1) the exceptional importance for Calvin of theological form and method; formally, though not in content, he was a rationalist dialectician rather than a metaphysician proper. That is, he did not so much construct a view of the universe as weave together dialectically what he took to be religious certainties. (2) His system is a *complexio oppositorum*, i.e. there is no attempt to base everything on a fundamental idea, but the great doctrines of

the past, even those which logically contradict each other, are bound up in one connected whole. (3) The formal law of theology is for him Biblicism. Bauke holds, correctly I should say, that previous attempts to mark out *material* principles, whether one or more, have failed. Calvin, moreover, was not dependent on any philosophy for actual results.

Bauke at various points opens up a wide vista of inquiry still awaiting the chosen scholar. There is much to do, for instance, in elucidating Calvin's relation to Humanism, as well as Humanism's relation to the Bible and to other sources of a historical and doctrinal kind. Again, is Calvin's idea of God Scotist or not? By what channels did the orthodoxy of the Middle Ages reach the Reformer? The whole background of Calvin's thinking has to be lighted up and made real to the modern mind.

Summing up, Bauke declares that what Calvin really does is to translate the religion of Luther into a foreign tongue and a rather alien kind of human life. But it *is* the same religion. As theology, Calvin's thought forms an original type by itself. He wrought into one whole the Gospel and a conception of life *in* the world, so that for him Christian redemption and Christian politics are one. The doctrine of Predestination, as all scholars with one possible exception agree, is not the central doctrine of Calvin, nor is it speculative. It is simply the dialectic and rationalistic affirmation of what is taken to be religious fact, without

<sup>1</sup> *Die Probleme der Theologie Calvins*, by Hermann Bauke (Hinrichs, Leipzig, 1922; pp. viii, 108; 2s. 5d.).



explanation and without derivation. It is the formal keystone of the arch, and has been quarried from Scripture. Luther had it before him.

It is a disappointment to hear nothing of the first edition of the *Institutes*, in various religious ways so much superior to the later edition which the English reader knows best. Also the distinction of matter and form is slightly overworked. But as a whole Bauke's short treatise, which we hope may take a fuller shape one day, is thoroughly sound, condensed, interesting, and sympathetic. To all who care about the origins of Calvinistic doctrine it will be indispensable.

Dr. Wach has written an able and well-documented booklet on the idea of Redemption, and its varied expressions in the history of religion.<sup>1</sup> The first part is given to a psychological interpretation of personality, the second to historical illustration of what men have thought it means to be redeemed. Hegel is the philosopher of the historical embodiments of reason, and in the earlier pages his influence is deep-reaching; there are also frequent allusions to Dilthey and Max Weber the sociologist. Wach is a keen, enthusiastic writer, who makes great psychological discoveries every here and there, not all unimportant. He is studying types of personality, and gives a good many pages to the contrast between the ego-affirming type (Goethe) and the ego-negating type (Kierkegaard), which are as old as history and religion. A specially interesting line of connexion is drawn between the ego-negating type and the yearning for redemption, whether thought of as immanent or transcendent. This sort of personality is more emotional, Wach thinks, but contributes relatively little to civilization. Of course at times 'redemption' may take on an extremely vague sense, meaning little more than getting hold of something that will take us out of ourselves and make us 'forget.' How the longing for redemption will affect a man's relation to, and worth for, society is also discussed suggestively. The study is a subtle and patient and truth-loving one, and the bibliography is rich; but the author has troubled little about the form of his writing, and his prose is curiously invertebrate.

Chapter II. is far more interestingly done. Here it is asked under what forms redemption has been sought, from what, by what means, and to what end—an ambitious programme, but one that Dr. Wach tackles with great competence. He confesses a peculiar debt to Heiler, whose fine books are waiting for a translator. Man in history wishes to be saved from plagues, death, stars, fate, law, transmigration, karma, guilt, the lower self. And the longing has had an immense influence on psychological development. Gradually we come in sight of that dualism within the soul which is exemplified by nearly all great philosophical systems of the modern epoch, breaking out at times into the conviction that human personality cannot really be mended and must be ended. Again, redemption has been conceived in two competing ways—as wrought by self and as wrought by Another. Belief in salvation by Another may well lead to regular norms of procedure for all, binding as doctrines, but self-redemption is virtually incompatible with fixed rules of doctrine, 'for only the man himself, but no one before him or after, can tell the path that will lead *him* to salvation' (p. 77). The different conceptions of a Mediator are set out carefully, all greater Eastern faiths being laid under contribution. One feels how often and how profoundly men had dreamt of Christ before God's time came, and He appeared. The process of redemption, viewed objectively, has sometimes been thought to have taken place dramatically in the beginning of the world, prior to human history, the *dramatis personæ* being mythological beings; sometimes, on the contrary, it is announced for the End of all things. 'The more prominently the person of the Redeemer comes into the foreground of the redemptive work or process, the more the emotions of the worshipper are stimulated' (p. 88). Other topics are the media of redemption, as ascetic practices or faith; and some interesting forms of what may be called temporary redemption, best illustrated in Schopenhauer. These last take their orientation from art, and are naturally infected by its temper of loved illusion.

Wach is occupied solely with the history of ideas; he makes no attempt to say which is the better or best form of redemption. Quotations and references are given perhaps with an excessive fullness, and misprints are frequent. But the book is to be warmly welcomed for its full and orderly

<sup>1</sup> *Der Erlösungsgedanke und seine Deutung*, by Joachim Wach, D.Phil. (Hinrichs, Leipzig, 1922; pp. 104; 2s. 5d.).

presentment of data, and its impartial and scientific spirit.

'Faith lives not on revelation alone, but on mystery as well; and it thinks in antinomies.' This concluding sentence of Mulert's deeply thoughtful, if not particularly well-arranged, *brochure* on Prayer, Freedom, and God,<sup>1</sup> might be taken as its motto. It is a theoretical discussion, but theory may help practice. Throughout the writer has Schleiermacher in view, and his 'resigned' conception of prayer. As to that, he asks several questions, and debates them gravely and persistently. Can God be influenced; and if not, is not human freedom denied, and our fellowship with God turned into illusion? If we must not ask God for anything, where is the reason of *thanking* Him? If God cannot be acted upon, has the prayer for forgiveness a real sense? The paradoxes of faith are never overlooked. Freedom is logically inconceivable, while determinism is psychologically impracticable and is anyhow an intellectualistic theory far removed from life. 'Faith in a living God and in the hearing of prayer is an interpretation of the world that answers to belief in human freedom. And both hang together in this respect, that we cannot conceive either freedom or God without contradiction'—yet both are real (p. 45). A similar antinomy appears in the fact that *in* a generally determined world morality demands a free human will, while faith asks for a sovereign God *over* it. No coercive proof that God hears prayer can be given, though for centuries the Church said it could; and a certain inconsistency in arguments conducted in these high latitudes may, after all, be a sign of depth, not shallowness. Mulert argues strongly for the courage to say in religion that, at point after point, we do not know. We must reverence the secrets of God; we must neither assert that all things are completely determined nor must we seek to change God's mind. The War has taught

<sup>1</sup> *Gebetserhörnung, Freiheitsglaube, Gottesglaube*, by Professor Hermann Mulert (Hinrichs, Leipzig, 1921; pp. 62; 1s. 2d.).

us to practise reserve in our statements regarding the ways of Providence. There is a particularly rewarding discussion of what precisely faith means by its great phrase 'the living God,' and it is pointed out that when we use that phrase we are specially thinking of His feeling and His supreme activity. Livingness, as an attribute of God, is not ultimately incompatible with unchangingness, if 'unchanging' be taken in a moral sense. We must take our thoughts of religion less from the observation of nature than from the experiences of moral life; if we do, the 'resigned' view of prayer will seem less true than a more positive interpretation.

Mulert writes with great fairness to the religious force of opposing arguments. But he holds from beginning to end that the question of prayer is the question of God's activity as such. There is an impressive power in his emphasis on the 'livingness' of God, and on the conception of man that answers to it. 'The world-view of determinism is clearer, but that of faith in freedom is more profound.'

Archbishop Söderblom, the well-known authority on the History of Religions, prints two sermons for the times.<sup>2</sup> In the first he argues that a great revival is approaching, for suffering has taught the world the deepest sense of the Cross. In the second, he pleads that for the Church in our age the pathway is that of service, of pain, and of miracle. Nothing could be more suggestive than his picture of Calvary as the fulfilment of dim rites and mystery-cults of yore. 'God has a share in our pain.' Söderblom speaks of Jesus with a singular thrill in his voice. What he longs for is a synthesis of the old heart-felt love for Christ, with its message of the Cross and its mystic passion, and the newer ethical propaganda of the Kingdom of God. This second sermon especially must have been a great thing to hear.

H. R. MACKINTOSH.

Edinburgh.

<sup>2</sup> *Zur religiösen Frage der Gegenwart*, by Nathan Söderblom (Hinrichs, Leipzig, 1921; pp. 32; 5d.).



## In the Study.

### *Virgíñibus Puerisque.*

#### Learning to Walk.<sup>1</sup>

'When I fall, I shall get up.'—Mic 7<sup>8</sup>.

THE other day you were standing for a long time, at a match or somewhere else, and before the end you got tired a bit about the legs. Why? What made your legs get weary in that fashion? The answer to that is a queer one, for the clever people say that it is this. Long, long ago folk didn't stand on two legs as we all do now, but on four, one at each corner, keeping them comfy and steady like a table. That would be very handy sometimes even yet. If in a football scrum when you are charged you could let down two extra feet and stand fast! But by and by people began to think that they might manage with two, and that would leave their forefeet free for other things, for shying stones at strangers who came too near and who looked fierce and unfriendly! And so they tried and they tried, but they didn't make much of it. And indeed it wasn't easy, was dreadfully hard. They stood up and went flop; or they went wobbling for a step or two, like you when you were learning to bicycle; but they kept on trying, and at last they managed it; learned how to poise themselves on two legs, and their front feet became those wonderful hands with which men can do almost anything. But it took them a long time, and little blame to them! For it was about as difficult as if you were to tilt your cycle up into the air on its back rim, and try to ride like that. Indeed, none of us is quite perfect at it even yet. When you got tired the other day your legs were saying, 'But, look here, this isn't good enough! We're getting far too much to do! There ought to be two other legs to give us a hand!' And that tired feeling meant that at the back of your head you were thinking that you would like to get down on all fours in the old way, and so be steadier. We've been learning to stand up for thousands of years, and we've got pretty good at it, but we're not perfect even yet! To learn some things, you see, takes time, takes a long time, and yet you won't take any. There's music. At first you thought it was going to be grand, got quite excited over it. In a few weeks you would be able to play, and you were going to do it really well, so splendidly that perhaps

<sup>1</sup> By the Reverend A. J. Gossip, M.A., Aberdeen.

the organist in your church would come and say, 'You take a Sunday and show me how to do it, for you are so much better than I!' Yes, you were going to enjoy it hugely, and be a real player. But when you found that you didn't start with tunes, but with picking out the notes, and that there were scales and exercises, and that you had to stick in every night, you soon got tired. 'Ach!' you said, 'I can't be bothered trying any longer!' Down you flopped upon all fours, and have been scampering on them ever since, will never learn to stand up now, have lost all the joy of music just because you couldn't take a little pains. Or, at school you got into a row and you were scared a bit, said to yourself, 'Well, I suppose I'll just have to learn to get up on these hind legs of mine!' But it's been rainy weather, and in the evenings it cleared up, and you so wanted to get out to play; or there was something splendid on down at the picture house; anyway your legs soon got tired, and you are going on all fours again, are tumbling steadily down the class. Why, baby could give you a lesson! At first it was shameful the way she crawled about; she was as bad as a monkey; worse! No self-respecting monkey would dream of wriggling along on its tummy as she did. But one day she got up on her feet. And she was as pleased and proud as if she were the very first who had ever thought of that. She laughed and crowed and wanted every one to look at her. And yet it was no very great performance! A step and down she went, and cried if it was a hard bump, and laughed if it was a soft one. But always she got up again and kept on trying, though she didn't seem to make much of it, or get any better. Still she tried and tried and tried, and managed it at last, and now she can walk as well as you. And sometimes you look at Jesus Christ, who was always brave and never whined nor whimpered but kept His head up gallantly, who never got sulky when things went wrong, was never selfish nor tempery, nor cross, nor any of the horrid things into which you keep tumbling time on time; and you feel, that's what I would like to be, as brave and clean and straight as that. That's a wise choice. But, mind you, it will take some doing! You mustn't think that you can learn it all in a day. Sometimes your temper will blaze out before you know. Well, when that happens it's a pity, but as this wise man

said, 'If I tumble, I'll get up again'; if I tumble, and really hard, twenty times a day, well, I'll rise twenty times, and try once more. Now and then when you're not watching you'll forget and be grabby and greedy and cross. You're down, are you? Well, look at baby, she is up already; and you too must just get up upon your shuggly legs, and try and try and keep on trying, and they will get more steady by and by. It has taken us a long time to learn to stand, and we're not perfect at it even yet, but we're not going back now to running on all fours! No fear! And really you will do better than you think. When baby tries to walk, father is never very far away, keeps his arms round her, just a little bit out from her so that, if she stumbles, she won't really fall, only into his arms. And there's a wise man in the Bible who tells us we too have a Father, a wonderful Father, kind and patient and loving, who is teaching us to walk, to master our hot passions, and to keep our temper. He holds our hand tight in His, and He will help us every day and all the day, till we can do it perfectly.

#### How to Recognize a Person.

'Even a child is known by his doings.'—Pr 20<sup>11</sup>.

I was reading about a Baby Show in the papers the other day. It was one of those papers, you know, with pictures in it, and there was a picture of the babies—lovely, chubby, laughing little things, and I think there was a separate photo of the one that got the prize for being healthiest and fattest and biggest. But what I couldn't help wondering was what would happen if the babies got mixed. They all looked so very much alike, and even their clothes seemed to be the same. Of course I know that there is something which distinguishes one baby from another—even twins—so that you can say, 'That is Jack, and the other is Tom,' but you have to be with them a good deal before you can do that. And I believe it is only the mothers, really, who can be quite sure.

Sometimes we know people by the way they walk, and even when they are a long way off we can recognize them quite easily. Sometimes we know them by the clothes they wear. But that is not a very good way, because a new hat and a new coat and skirt make such a difference. Sometimes we know them by the tone of their voice, although they are not visible to us. And, alas! sometimes we know them by the things they say and by the words they use, which make us feel unhappy and sorry.

But there is still another way. It is the way of our text. 'Even a child,' it says, 'is known by his doings.' What a boy *does*, tells us what he *is*. Always? Well, not always, perhaps. Because you know that there are some boys and girls who are very charming and kind and thoughtful when there are visitors, or when they are out to tea. But when they are alone at home, or playing among themselves, it is a very different story. These same boys may be looking for a worm to frighten their sisters with, and these same girls may be trying to stick a pin into their brothers. And the boy who is so pleasant and agreeable when there is company, can be very short and bad-tempered when he is asked to run a message by his mother. But whatever outsiders think about them, the people at home know them, and they know them by their doings.

You remember that when Robinson Crusoe was on his island he discovered a footprint in the sand one day. He thought he was alone on the island, but that footprint showed him that a man had been there. Sometimes mother comes into the kitchen and she notices the cupboard door open and signs of jam on the table, and she says, 'I thought so! That boy has been in here while I was away.' He is known by his doings, you see.

Perhaps you say to yourself, 'I am only a child after all, and it doesn't really matter what I do.' But it does matter. It matters tremendously. It matters to your father and mother, because you can't expect them to be happy if you are behaving badly. They want you to be a credit to them too, and that depends on your doings. And it matters to yourself, because if you do right now you are more likely to do right when you are older. The habits that you form now will go with you when you grow up into men and women, and so it is a very important thing for your own sake that you should 'learn to do well' when you are young. But most of all, it matters to God. You know what they said about His Son when He was on the earth. They said, 'He went about doing good,' not just thinking about it, or speaking about it, but *doing* it. And He expects us to do the same. Each of us in our own little world can follow His example and go about doing good.

Father, lead me day by day,  
Ever in Thine own sweet way;  
Teach me to be pure and true,  
Show me what I ought to do.



## The Christian Year.

TWENTY-FOURTH SUNDAY AFTER TRINITY.

### The Power of a Feeble Faith.

'But Jesus said . . . thy faith hath made thee whole.'—Mt 9<sup>22</sup>.

Dean Goulburn has an interesting essay on 'How to deal with our Interruptions.' He points out that, while most busy men welcome interruptions much as they would the visit of a tiger or a cobra, Jesus used them as the occasions of His noblest works. It was so with some of His finest parables: it was so with this miracle.

It is a miracle within a miracle. Jesus is going on an errand of life and death. In such an hour we would resent an interruption with what seems a just resentment, but He made use of it to do one of His most beautiful works.

'Thy faith hath made thee whole.' Nothing strikes us more as we read the Gospels than the fact that our Saviour always required faith when He worked miracles. He *could* not do His mighty works except for those who had faith. And yet how often the faith which He accepted as sufficient would have been looked upon by us in our superiority as naught but superstition? Our text, taken from the Gospel for the day, is an illustration of this. What could be more superstitious than the motive which led the woman to touch Christ's garment in order to obtain the healing which she needed? Her one thought may have been no more than this: My life is embittered and made miserable by this terrible disorder; the physicians have been powerless to give me relief; here is this young teacher who is working cures far and wide; perchance He may do me some good. She had perhaps never seen the Lord; she had perhaps never heard His words. She thought of Him, it may be, as ignorant people still think of holy wells, or relics of saints, that work marvellous cures of all sorts of disorders. She had no conception of the Divine will of the Christ being exerted on her behalf; she conceived that she might even extract a cure from Him against His will, or at least without His knowledge—'If I may but touch His garment, I shall be whole.' Even when the cure was wrought, nothing entered into her mind as its cause, save this magic touch. Was it not gross superstition? Yet the Lord Himself turns to her, and says, 'Thy faith hath made thee whole.' The faith was real,

however it may have been coloured and hidden by superstition.<sup>1</sup>

1. Her faith was real, but it was feeble. How was this woman's a feeble faith? It was so, first of all, because it was a *bankrupt* faith. It was the discipline of failure brought her to Christ. The sad story of her life is told by St. Mark.

Hers had been a weary race for health. Would she have come to Christ sooner had she known of Him? One cannot tell. At all events she is typical of many a soul. They come to the Good Physician only when they have failed everywhere else. Christ is the last resource.

2. Yet there is one thing about such a faith that makes it always great. It is a *desperate* faith. It is a self-despairing faith. It has no temptation to make reservations and 'go halves' with God.

Nothing in my hand I bring,  
Simply to Thy Cross I cling,

is the burden of its song. It has learnt its own weakness too well not to be willing to cast itself all on God. And for this Jesus loves it: for this He accepts it.

3. Once more, this woman's was an *ignorant* faith. That comes out in her self-communings as she resolved to make trial of the new Healer of Nazareth. 'If I may but touch his garment, I shall be whole.' At first sight that looks a very wonderful faith. It seems to mean that she had such an exalted view of the Saviour that she imagined the virtue lay even in His clothes. But when we connect it with her action, we see it was something very different from this. She appears to think she can get a blessing from Christ's clothes without the conscious co-operation of Christ Himself. She seems to imagine that His body is a kind of galvanic battery which radiates healing without any spiritual or ethical element in it at all. This may be faith, but it is faith mixed with a great deal of superstition. It is the faith of the fetish-worshipper, not the faith of a Christian.

It is just touching Christ's clothes. The clothes of religion, as the Great Philosopher of Clothes reminds us, are its outward forms and rites, its sacraments and creeds, its institutions and tithes. These things are necessary, for the spirit must ever have a body for its investiture. But though religion needs clothes, it must always be more than

<sup>1</sup> H. J. Lawlor, *Thoughts on Belief and Life*, 151.

clothes. And often, alas ! it is far less. The clothes are not only old and ill-fitting, but they cover a dead Christ, like those old monks in the cemetery of the Capuchins in Rome, where you see a grinning skeleton peering out beneath the friar's cowl.

So with multitudes to-day. As St. Ambrose says, 'Multitudes press on Christ in outward ordinances, but believers alone touch Him.' They come to church, observe its sacraments, pay its dues, recite its creeds, but, alas ! its spirit never enters them, never touches their heart, never moulds their life. They practically say, 'If I may but touch His clothes, I shall be whole.' But in the case of the woman her actions went deeper than her words. As she pressed through to touch His clothes, to her poor thinking, she was really pressing through to touch Himself.<sup>1</sup>

You remember the story. He looked around to see who had done this thing, and He called her out. Now, why did He do that ? The woman was healed. Why not let her slip out of the crowd and go back to her village ? Why make her come out before all the people and stand before that critical eye ? Was it a necessary embarrassment ? Was it kind ? Well, the way to understand many things in this world is to compare the alternative. Suppose Jesus had not done it, what would have happened ? This would have happened : the woman would have gone away to her village full of the idea of the magic of this new Prophet's clothes. 'I touched them, and they healed me. If only we could get hold of some cast-off garment of His, we could heal the whole place !' She would go home full of erroneous ideas, thinking that Christ's clothes were a source of healing, and if she could get some discarded garment of His she would set it up as a fetish in the village. She would have become a preacher of downright superstition. But He called her out. He called her 'daughter.' She called Him 'Master.' He spoke to her ; He established a personal relationship between Himself and her. Then when that woman went home, do you think she ever mentioned Christ's clothes ? She went home full of the idea of a new Friend, a new Master, a new Saviour whom she had found. She went home to be a preacher, not of superstition, but a preacher of true religion ; not Christ's clothes, but Christ Himself.

Personal relations with Christ, a personal knowledge of Christ, as John Wesley and Charles Simeon would have used the phrase, a conscious assurance, a spiritual conviction, about which there is nothing either superstitious or second-hand, has been in the past, and will be in the future, the quickening power of a rational and progressive faith.

It is ever thus. New conditions make new demands on personal life. The world needs a revival. Then let us revive ourselves. We cannot go on for ever living upon the accumulated capital of past experience. It is the testimony of all Christian history that the living Lord will re-interpret Himself as the power of our rational and progressive life to-day, when once we have seen Him.

'Have I not seen the Lord ?' There was the transcendent fact that underlay the spiritual life, the churchmanship, the apostleship, the witness of St. Paul. That, too, will be the secret of all strong personal life in the days that are yet to be. Here and here alone shall we learn the deep mystery of our own being. Here and here alone shall we understand the one cause of failure, personal alienation from God, which is sin. Here and here alone shall we discover that radiant joy of living, that elixir of which alchemists have dreamed, but of which the secret was never learned till the forgiveness of sins was proclaimed by Christ regnant on Calvary, Christ who is made to us righteousness, sanctification, and redemption.<sup>2</sup>

#### TWENTY-FIFTH SUNDAY AFTER TRINITY.

##### The Whole of Religion.

'What doth the Lord require of thee, but to do justly, and to love mercy, and to walk humbly with thy God ?'—Mic 6<sup>s</sup>.

In *The Book of the Twelve Prophets* Sir George Adam Smith says of this text : 'This is the greatest saying of the Old Testament ; and there is only one other in the New which excels it :

"Come unto me, all ye that labour and are heavy laden, and I will give you rest.

"Take my yoke upon you, and learn of me ; for I am meek and lowly in heart : and ye shall find rest unto your souls.

"For my yoke is easy, and my burden is light."

He describes the circumstances of the reply of the prophet in the following paragraph.

<sup>2</sup> J. G. Simpson, *Christian Ideals*, 61.

<sup>1</sup> W. Mackintosh Mackay, *Bible Types of Modern Women*, 292.



'In most of the controversies which the prophets open between God and man, the subject on the side of the latter is his sin. But that is not so here. In the controversy which opens the Book of Micah the argument falls upon the transgressions of the people, but here upon their sincere though mistaken methods of approaching God. There God deals with dull consciences, but here with darkened and imploring hearts. In that case we had rebels forsaking the true God for idols, but here are earnest seekers after God, who have lost their way and are weary. Accordingly, as indignation prevailed there, here prevails pity; and though formally this be a controversy under the same legal form as before, the passage breathes tenderness and gentleness from first to last. By this as well as by the recollections of the ancient history of Israel we are reminded of the style of Hosea. But there is no expostulation, as in his book, with the people's continued devotion to ritual. All that is past, and a new temper prevails. Israel have at last come to feel the vanity of the exaggerated zeal with which Amos pictures them exceeding the legal requirements of sacrifice; and with a despair, sufficiently evident in the superlatives which they use, they confess the futility and weariness of the whole system, even in the most lavish and impossible forms of sacrifice. What then remains for them to do? The prophet answers with the beautiful words, that express an ideal of religion to which no subsequent century has ever been able to add either grandeur or tenderness.

He hath shown thee, O man, what is good;  
And what is the Lord seeking from thee,  
But to do justice and love mercy,  
And humbly to walk with thy God?'<sup>1</sup>

Micah's statement might be paraphrased as follows without altering its essential meaning: Religion in its essence is righteousness and goodwill toward men and reverent humility and obedience toward God. And this is no lonely utterance of this prophet; it is the underlying idea of both prophetic and apostolic teaching as well as of the teaching of our Lord. Whatever our theological faith, whatever our religious practices, and whatever our religious pedagogics, their sole use and value consist in helping us to lives of love and righteousness before God and man. This is the

<sup>1</sup>i. 423.

purpose for which they exist, and it is this that gives them meaning and justification.

It is a great text. Huxley, writing in *The Nineteenth Century* for December 1885, said: 'If any so-called religion takes away from this great saying of Micah, I think it wantonly mutilates, while, if it adds thereto, I think it obscures, the perfect ideal of religion.'

Gladstone, who had been engaged in a controversy with Huxley, replied: 'I will not dispute that in these words is contained the true ideal of discipline and attainment.'

It is a great text and it divides itself naturally into three, as texts should do—do justly, love mercy, walk humbly with thy God.

1. *Do justly*.—The Lord demands of us first of all an absolute integrity in all our relations, public and private, with our fellow-men, not only in our actions towards them, but in our thoughts and feelings regarding them. In our way of judging them, in our expressed opinions of them, we are to be scrupulously fair and just. Have we ever asked ourselves exactly what God's requirements of justice from us would be? Have we ever brought the searchlight of an awakened conscience upon our attitude to the social conditions in which we live to-day, and in which we are far too ready to acquiesce?

2. *Love mercy*.—He wants us, next, to be more than merely just; to show *all mercifulness and tenderness* in our dealings with men; a mercifulness of feeling that will lead to mercifulness in act: and this, not from compulsion of conscience only, but from generosity of heart. We are to 'love mercy.' Feeling how greatly we need mercy ourselves, we are to yield our rights rather than press them to the uttermost. We are to be what God Himself is, 'very pitiful and of tender mercy': and this, all the more because our own mercifulness may often, like God's mercy, win a transgressor whom harshness would only drive farther away.

What kind of judgment do I mete out to the poor, erring, wandering sister of the streets? What does my Christianity compel me to do to her? Gather up my skirts when she passes by? Or to deal as mercifully as God has dealt with me? Notice that we are to 'love mercy.' When we love a thing we keep it at its best. We would not mar its excellence or detract one whit from its beauty. Let our love of mercy lead us to keep mercy at her highest and best. Let it not degenerate into sickly sentiment. Temper justice with mercy, and mercy with

justice, even as the Lord Himself dealt with men.<sup>1</sup>

3. *Walk humbly with thy God.*—That is to say, to realize that in our own strength and by our own efforts we are morally incapable either of justice or of magnanimity as now defined. The ethical ideal which has been set before us in the first part of this definition of true religion is unobtainable except by the grace of God, and in the strength which He gives us.

Such a companionship will assuredly make us humble. How can there be any room for pride in a heart that is so near to the Infinitely Holy One? Pride is the deadliest of sins. It was the sin by which Satan fell; by which Paradise was lost; by which the Lord of Glory was nailed to the accursed tree. It lies, somehow, at the root of every other sin; for sin is just the heart's proud refusal to bow to the commanding, or teaching, or arranging will of God. And it takes a thousand forms. It may appear as pride of intellect, or pride of position, or pride of power, as pride of race, or pride of nationality, or pride of ancestry, or pride of personal appearance, or pride of wealth. It may be pride of look, or pride of speech, or pride of life. It may even be pride of grace—that Pharisaic pride that is the most unreasonable and most offensive of all.

Let us clothe ourselves every morning in a fresh garment of humility, and so be *heaven-like*—for even sinless seraphs bow before the throne of heaven's King; and *Christlike* too—for He 'humbled himself even to the death of the cross,' and was always 'meek and lowly in heart.' The lowlier we are, we only the more resemble Him.<sup>2</sup>

#### TWENTY-SIXTH SUNDAY AFTER TRINITY.

##### Learn.

'Learn to do well.'—Is i<sup>17</sup>.

THE question is often asked, What is it that distinguishes man from the lower animals? A variety of answers have been given to it. Some say man is the only living being who can laugh. Others say he is the only creature who cooks his food. Carlyle thought that the great distinction between man and other animals is that a man can make use of tools. But there is a more fundamental distinction than any of these. Man and man

only can learn. The lark builds its nest just as it has built it through the generations, and a very beautiful nest it is. Individual animals like the horse and the dog may learn a little in their lifetime, but the horse and dog as species make no progress in learning. Man alone learns, both as an individual and as man. So it is to you and to me that the prophet addresses this word of his when he says 'learn.'

What have we to learn? First of all we have to learn to develop the body and to make it as fit as possible for the work it has to do in the world.

Then we have to learn to educate the mind. And just as we find that seldom in the history of the world has so much attention been paid to the training of the body as to-day, so we find that the science of education has been brought to a high pitch of perfection to-day.

But we are not made up of body and mind only. Is there not also a soul, and if there is, has it not also to be trained? It does not matter if we prefer to use some other word for soul. We may call it conscience. Conscience has to be educated, even as the body and soul have to be. Bishop Gore says that in his visit to India nothing impressed him more than the sight of an Indian holy man in one of the main streets of Calcutta. He was stretched at full length in the street, then rose up, and lay down again putting his feet where his head was before, and in that painful and slow way he was making a pilgrimage to Benares. Bishop Gore says that his first feeling was one of disgust, but that gave way to pity. How much that earnest man might have done of real good if only his conscience had been enlightened.

How do we teach the soul? It is the most difficult part to train. But we have left its training to chance far more than the training of the body and the mind. And yet we can see some progress to-day. Education is much more a moral thing than it used to be. We might even say that it is much more a spiritual thing. Its aim is exactly expressed by Isaiah's words, 'Learn to do well.'

How, then, are we to learn to do well?

1. First we need the gift for it. That is recognized in every department of knowledge and of work. If a man is to do supremely well in anything he must have the gift for it. One of our painters was looking at a picture done by a pupil, and he saw many things to commend in it. 'But,' he said, 'it wants "that."' And wanting 'that'

<sup>1</sup> W. B. Selbie, in *CWP*, lxxvii. 300.

<sup>2</sup> G. H. Knight, *These Three*, II.



it really wanted everything. Now if we are going to learn to do well we must have the gift for it. When do we get that gift, and where? At birth? It may be that there is to some extent what is called an inclination to religion born with some. But the gift which enables us to do well is not so much a gift of birth as a gift of second birth. Now this Christian awakening is possible for everybody. A genius for religion is within the reach of every human being.

2. But we also need a pattern. We need a headline to the copybook of life. And if we are to learn to do well the question is whether the pattern should be good or bad. Is it better to have a good pattern so that we may follow it, or a bad pattern that we may avoid it? As we read the newspapers and many of the modern novels, we conclude that in the judgment of journalists and novelists it is better to have a bad pattern than a good one. In the review of a book published not long ago a weekly paper says: 'The author has chosen a hero of unrelieved detestability, and has shown him as a false friend, an unfaithful husband, a bad father, one who rides roughshod over all the common decencies of life and finally escapes punishment by the cheap resort of sentimental suicide.'

Is it a bad pattern that we want, then? Are drunkards reformed by seeing drunkards? If you give a child a specimen of bad writing it will reproduce the badness. No! it is a good pattern that we need. And more than that, we need the best pattern. And the best is Christ. It was by making Christ their pattern that the early disciples learnt to do well. Jesus Himself invites us to adopt this method. 'Learn of me,' He says.

3. The third thing we need is practice. The gift alone is not enough. The example to follow is not enough. We must *use* the gift, and we must follow the example. And that means practice. It is so in every department of life. Well, then, practise to do well; practise doing well.

Practise, for example, *contentment*. 'I have learned in whatsoever state I am therewith to be content.' No man ever was content by nature. But when it is finally acquired it is a great grace.

Practise *sincerity*. We do not do that by nature. We think more or less of the effect of our words. When that is carried to extremes we speak of a person as unreal. There is no excellence of character without sincerity—meaning what we say and doing what we mean—and we have to learn it.'

We have to learn *truthfulness*. We are only too ready to exaggerate, to distort or colour our words in some way to suit our own purpose. There is only one way in which we can learn to be truthful, and that is by practising truth.

But more than all, and summing them all up, we have to *learn Christ*. It is a peculiar phrase, but it is Paul's. Writing to the Ephesians he tells them to learn Christ, and he tells them how to do it. We use the same sort of language ourselves. 'What are you learning at school?' we ask, and the boy replies, 'Cæsar.' He means that he is reading the story of Cæsar's doings in Gaul. Paul wanted the Ephesians, and he wants us, to read the story of Christ's doings upon earth, and to do as He did. What is the story? It is that He went about continually doing good. That is one of the ways of learning Christ—to take the opportunity of doing good wherever we are.

But the boy who is learning Cæsar is learning more than the story of Cæsar's doings in Gaul. He is learning something about Cæsar himself. When Paul said, 'Learn Christ,' he meant more than learn about what He did on earth. He meant learn who He was. Christ's example is the best we can have, but Christ Himself is better than His example. Learn Christ. Look at Him. Think about Him. Believe in Him. Make Him your own. Give yourself to Him for life and for death.

Yea, through life, death, through sorrow and through sinning

He shall suffice me, for He hath sufficed:  
Christ is the end, for Christ was the beginning,  
Christ the beginning, for the end is Christ.

#### FIRST SUNDAY IN ADVENT.

##### The Dew.

'I will be as the dew unto Israel.'—Hos 14<sup>5</sup>.

How quietly the dew falls upon the grass! silently, imperceptibly. It makes no noise. No one hears it dropping.

It comes in the night-time, when no one can see its beautiful work, and covers the blades of grass and the leaves with clusters of pearls. There is something almost mysterious about it. For there is a controversy whether it falls at all, whether it does not rise from off the earth. Perhaps it neither rises nor falls, but is distilled from the air. It is strange that it is the things which are nearest to us,

with which we are most familiar, that we know least about.

Astronomers can explain the motions of far distant planets and predict to a moment the occurrence of an eclipse. But who can tell how the corn-seed bursts in the earth! how the grass grows and the dew is born to refresh it! So it is with the Spirit of God. We write great histories to describe the rise and progress of Christianity and the laws of its working in nations of men and ages of the world. But we cannot explain its operation in our own hearts. 'The wind bloweth where it listeth, and thou hearest the sound thereof, but canst not tell whence it cometh, and whither it goeth; so is every one that is born of the Spirit.' When God comes to the soul He comes thus quietly. The kingdom of heaven does not come with observation into our individual hearts. Like the dew upon the grass it is there before we know it. What we call a sudden conversion may have been preparing a long time in the earth, growing silently and imperceptibly there, before it burst through the soil and spread itself above to be seen by all. The dew may have been coming quietly, silently, for a long time before the great drop upon the blade of grass proclaims its presence to the common eye.

But though we cannot tell how God's Spirit comes, we can recognize its presence. How can we tell that the dew has fallen upon the blade of grass? We may stand out in the dark and feel nothing and see nothing, but in the morning we look at the blades of grass and the dew is thick upon them. How fresh and green they are! Touch them. How soft and cool they feel! We can tell the presence of God's Spirit by the effects. We can tell that God's favour is resting upon a man by the result it produces. This, at least, is no mysterious thing. The fruits of the Spirit are well known and easily recognized. They are these—love, joy, and peace. And besides these evident signs of its presence there is a freshness and beauty about a man's spirit, a fragrance shed abroad by it, when the favour of God rests upon it—just as the plants appear when the dew is settling upon them. This is a sure mark, for it cannot be imitated. It may be possible for some plants to maintain a vigorous existence in the driest, hardest soil, but they have none of the fragrance and softness of the tender grass when the dew lies heavy upon it. It may be possible for some men to do justly and walk uprightly in the eyes of the world,

without living in direct touch with God, but there is an easily recognized hardness and constraint in such a life. It wants the naturalness and freshness of a life that is lived in harmony with God.

But the dew does more than give freshness and sweetness to grass and plants. It is also the great means of their growth. 'Consider the lilies,' says our Lord, 'how they grow.' How do they grow? Is it by struggle and effort and exertion on their own part? There is no growth like that.

'I remember, ten years ago,' says Dr. Campbell Morgan, 'when I first set my face to the other side of the sea, my boy, six years of age, said to me as he bade me good-bye, "How long shall you be away?" I told him two months. He said, "I am going to try hard to grow as big as you are before you come back." I am not sure that he tried. I suspect he forgot, as children do so blessedly forget their follies. But if he did try he did not succeed. No child grows by effort. No man by being anxious can add one cubit to his stature.'

The lilies grow by drawing freely from the stores of dew that fall upon them while rooted in the firm earth. And the Christian grows by drinking freely of the grace, the favour of God, while being firmly grounded upon God's precious promises. So he grows naturally, as the blades of grass grow.

I will leave it with Him,  
The lilies all do,  
And they grow.  
They grow in the rain,  
And they grow in the dew,  
Yes, they grow.  
They grow in the darkness  
All hid in the night,  
They grow in the sunshine  
Revealed by the light,  
Still they grow.

Here is another unmistakable mark of him upon whom the favour of God is resting. He grows as the lily grows, symmetrically, completely, beautifully proportioned. The man who grows only in the eye of the world is sure to be unshapely and deformed in some respect. Sooner or later some defect reveals itself. Experience tells us so.

When the dew is falling in its ordinary way it falls on all plants alike. Flowers and weeds, fruit trees and poisonous plants, all receive their share. If they spread their leaves out to receive it the re-



refreshing dew will light upon them. They may convert it into poison, yet it does not pass them by. So the favour of God in His ordinary providence rests on all alike. But He has reserved a special blessing for those who know how to obtain it. We are told that some plants have the power of receiving an additional supply of refreshing dew beyond that which falls upon the earth and other plants around. It is when the earth has become cooler than the surrounding air that the dew falls upon it. And the cooler any part is, the more dew will light upon that part. Now some plants have the power of cooling themselves, so that they become cooler than others that are around them. Thus the dew falls more copiously on them.

So with us. We can draw liberally out of treasures of joy which the unthankful have never discovered. It is not that God is partial in the distribution of His gifts. His stores are free and open to all, but all have not the skill to draw their riches forth. What is the skill we need? It is the same as the plants employ. It is the skill to give, to give forth, to impart. He that hath, to him shall be given—and how? by his willingness to share what he has with those around him. ‘Give, and it shall be given unto you; good measure, pressed down,

running over.’ It is by sharing with others the gifts which God has given us and doing so in His name that we obtain His special blessings. It is by loving one another, by serving one another, by denying ourselves for the brethren that we get the skill to secure the grace and favour of God.

And perhaps the best way to do it is just as the dew does—quietly—making our influence felt rather than seen or heard. ‘When thou doest alms,’ says our Lord, ‘let not thy left hand know what thy right hand doeth; that thine alms may be in secret.’

In his reply to the addresses of appreciation which were delivered at the meeting to celebrate his seventieth birthday, Dr. Miller said, ‘My one purpose is to fill the years so full of humble, loving service that every birthday shall mark a year of complete consecration to the Master. I would like my life to resemble the dew, which falls so noiselessly through the night and just as silently passes away, as soon as the rays of the morning sun beam upon the earth. Unnoticed by men’s eyes, save for an occasional sparkle here and there upon some blade of grass, it is drawn upward and passes away—but all that it has touched is freshened and beautified by its silent yet powerful presence.’

## Simon the Crucifer and Symeon the Prophet.

BY THE REVEREND A. B. KINSEY, B.A., B.D., RIPLEY.

MAY Simon of Cyrene (Mt 27<sup>32</sup>, Mk 15<sup>21</sup>, Lk 23<sup>26</sup>) and Symeon the ‘prophet,’ of Antioch (Ac 13<sup>1</sup>), with a large measure of probability be identified?

It was with a certain naïveté (possibly Dr. Samuel Johnson, with characteristic incisiveness, would have said ‘pure ignorance!’) that I was scarcely aware that the subject had been already considered, but the idea appeared so suggestive and plausible, and the cumulative arguments to point to such a high degree of verisimilitude, that the disappointment of the would-be pioneer deepened into a feeling nigh to chagrin (!) on the discovery that some weighty authorities had answered the above query in the negative.

But has full justice been given to all the points of the evidence?

The difference in the spelling of the names need

not, of course, detain us. Symeon (Συμεών), which, with a strange inconsistency, the RV sometimes prints thus, and sometimes Simeon, is obviously a transliteration of the Hebrew שִׁמְעוֹן. ‘Simon’ is regarded by Dr. W. Patrick (DCG) as ‘an independent Greek name,’ but many, perhaps most, scholars would agree with Dr. J. A. Selbie (DB) that it is ‘a later form of Simeon.’ In either case it is manifest that the two (whether names or forms of *one* name) are interchangeable. Two illustrations may be cited as sufficient evidence of this fact.

(a) James, ‘the Lord’s brother,’ and ‘bishop’ or pastor of the Church at Jerusalem, referring to Peter’s reminder of the Cornelius incident, says, ‘Symeon hath declared how God at the first did visit the Gentiles’ (Ac 15<sup>14</sup>); the archaic and

Hebraic form would be thoroughly consonant with James's temperament and manner of life.

(b) Then in 2 P 1<sup>1</sup> the best MSS, as followed by Lachmann, WH, and the margin of the RV (where it is almost proverbial that one may find the ripest scholarship of the revisers), read 'Symeon Peter, a servant and an apostle of Jesus Christ.' If the letter is authentic, it is obvious that the writer considers either form of his own name admissible, while on the (to the present writer wholly unwarranted) assumption of forgery, it is inconceivable that the impersonator should, at the very outset, make the apostle call himself by a title which would at once reveal an alien hand.

## I.

By a close study of the Gospels we may, perhaps, form our own 'Diatessaron' of the events of the tragic and triumphal procession to Calvary. Thence we infer (John's Gospel) that Christ alone bore the cross from the Hall of Judgment to the gate of the city: there Simon of Cyrene is encountered, coming in 'from the country' (Mk.), and 'him they compelled to bear the cross' (Mt.): the Lord is evidently manifesting signs that the strain is too great for Him, and the Roman soldiery hit upon this rough-and-ready method of expediting the proceedings: Luke adds two graphic touches: Simon at first bears only a portion of the cross ('after Jesus'); then as the physical exhaustion becomes extreme, Christ is relieved of it entirely (Jesus *turning unto* the women who followed, 23<sup>26, 27</sup>).

It is in accordance with our preconceptions that one who came into such close contact with our Lord and rendered Him such service should become a Christian, not indeed that salvation should be his *because of*, but *providentially owing to*, his act on that ever-memorable day.

But we have a surer guide than a speculative imagination: he is described (Mk 15<sup>21</sup>) as 'the father of Alexander and Rufus.' Obviously the Cyrenian not only suffered the indignity of being impressed by the Roman soldiers to perform the revolting task, but became so impressed, in a nobler sense, by the Saviour, that the hour of crisis made him a literal home-missionary, his sons proving thereafter well-known figures in the early Church. The name Alexander is perhaps too common to excite comment or to suggest identification with

any other of that appellation. 'The name,' says Dr. A. Robertson (DB), 'occurs five times in NT, and apparently belongs to as many distinct persons.' But it is noteworthy that 'Rufus' should be found only twice in NT. Of the Gospels it is Mark's alone which makes mention of the name: from the days of Papias the friend of Polycarp, who was the pupil of the Apostle John, Mark has been regarded as the interpreter of Peter, and as having written his Gospel at Rome and primarily for the Romans. The only other mention of the name is in the Epistle to the Romans (16<sup>13</sup>), where the bearer of it is described as 'chosen in the Lord,' or, as Dr. James Moffatt has faithfully and happily rendered the expression—'that choice Christian.' Thus, although 'Rufus is one of the commonest of slave names' (Drs. W. Sanday and A. C. Headlam, *Romans*, 'ICC'), both the place and the prominence would strongly favour the identification with the Rufus of Mk 15<sup>21</sup>. Possibly in later days he was one of those 'saints in Cæsar's household' who sent salutations to the Church at Philippi in the letter of Paul written 'in bonds' from Rome (Ph 4<sup>22</sup>). Concerning the salutation to the mother of Rufus, Mr. A. E. Wenham (*Ruminations on Romans*) writes: 'The mother of Rufus he greets as being his mother, being the mother of a brother,' but the comment would seem too jejune for further remark inasmuch as such an expression could be employed of the mother of *any* fellow-Christian. Drs. Sanday and Headlam would seem nearer the truth when they say that the salutation 'suggests that the apostle had received motherly kindness at the hands of the mother of Rufus.'

## II.

What now of 'Symeon that was called Niger'? The Church at Antioch, of which he was a leading member, was formed, we are told (Ac 11<sup>20</sup>), chiefly through the evangelistic zeal of the men of Cyprus and Cyrene, who, with that wider vision which Luke loves to record (contrast with the preceding verse—'unto the Jews only'), 'spoke unto the Greeks, preaching the Lord Jesus.'

One who hailed from Antioch, Gentile-born too, had, it is true, already been chosen as a member of the diaconate (Ac 6<sup>3</sup>), but he had found his way to the fuller light of the gospel through the intermediary of the lesser illumination of Judaism, and as the Christian Church does not appear at that



time to have extended its borders beyond Jerusalem, one may well surmise that it was in the 'holy city' that his complete 'conversion' took place.

The cosmopolitan character of the city of Antioch—itself an excellent preparation for missionary enthusiasm when any of its inhabitants were dominated by devotion to the cosmopolitan 'Son of Man'—is reflected in the varied personnel of the Church, Ac 13<sup>1</sup> giving a vivid portrayal not only of the unity in Christ of men coming from different lands, but also a prophetic glimpse into the consecration of wealth (Barnabas), of culture (Saul), and of regal courts (Manaen).

The name of Symeon, it will be observed, is immediately followed by that of Lucius of Cyrene.

Dr. James Stalker, who is apparently inclined to agree to the identification with 'Simon of Cyrene,' remarks concerning the word 'Niger'—"Black," a name not surprising for one who had been tanned by the hot sun of Africa."

### III.

No reference has hitherto been made to the nationality of Simon of Cyrene or of Symeon 'Niger.' It is not only a kindred topic, but, in the opinion of the present writer, one which markedly suggests their identification.

Curiously, while some scholars have suggested their identity, and others have dismissed the conception, the greater part of those who have considered the subject at all seem to assume that Simon of Cyrene was a Jew.

The two outstanding scholars who have thought otherwise are, perhaps, Dr. George Matheson and Dr. H. A. W. Meyer (the latter being quoted, apparently with approval, by Dean Alford). Dr. Meyer suggests that 'possibly Simon of Cyrene was a slave, the indignity of the service to be rendered preventing their taking any other person.'

According to Josephus, as the Jews raised the strongest objections to the task of furnishing 'posts' for the government, Demetrius, in his desire to conciliate them, issued the order that not even their beasts of burden should be 'commandeered' for government purposes. Doubtless such a regulation might well have become obsolete in the course of the intervening years, but even if so, and should the *animals* be again liable to be thus employed—is it probable that, on the occasion of a great national feast, when thousands of Jews (native and pro-

vincial) were gathered in Jerusalem, upon one of their number should be thrust the degrading and revolting task of acting as substitute for one condemned to death and bearing his instrument of torture? As our old friend Euclid might remark, if the seizure of animals had been prohibited, then *a fortiori*, that of men; or, in the words of a greater than Euclid—"How much more?"

One cannot but be surprised, then, at the confidence with which Rev. Harold Smith (*DCG*), after giving Strabo's classification of the inhabitants of Cyrene as '(i.) citizens, (ii.) husbandmen (native Libyans), (iii.) sojourners (*μέτοικοι*), and (iv.) Jews,' concludes, 'Simon of Cyrene was *doubtless* (*italics mine*) one of these Jewish settlers.'

The words of Dr. George Matheson carry with them the atmosphere of reality when he says, 'I do not think Simon was a Jewish colonist. I think he must have belonged to the slave population. I cannot conceive that a free man would have been the victim of such an indignity as to be forced to bear the cross of one on his way to crucifixion. The narrative continually points out that it was no voluntary act on his part: "him they *compelled* to bear His cross." There was not present at that moment a single man who would have accepted the burden with his will—probably not one that would have accepted it for hire. . . . If he had the blood of North Africa in his veins, his person in the eyes of the Jew was *associated* with slavery. He came from a hated race—the race of Ham.' Dr. Matheson further conceives Simon in 'complacency mingled with curiosity' thus communing with himself: 'The line of David crushed our line. Where is it now? The light of the royal line is going out in gloom. Truly the wrongs of the Canaanite have been at length avenged!'

Is there not also more than a mere coincidence in the fact that while the father should have this offensive burden—fitting task for a slave—thrust upon him, the name of one of his sons, 'Rufus,' should be, as cited previously for another purpose, the 'commonest of *slave* names'?

And the nationality of 'Symeon that was called Niger'? Dr. Stalker's identification with Simon of Cyrene and the reasonableness of the soubriquet have already been noted, but he obviously regards the Cyrenian as a Jewish settler. The mere fact that the 'cross-bearer' and the 'prophet' should

bear a Hebrew name is in itself not decisive as to nationality. That the bearer of a Jewish name is himself a Jew is certainly not conclusive reasoning! As justly, perhaps, might it be inferred that the 'paramount chief of the Basutos,' who, some little time since, interviewed King George, is a Welshman because he is named Griffith!

But if the 'prophet' is a Jew of Cyrene, whose dusky countenance has earned for him the title 'black,' why is not the word μέλας or κελαινός? Νίγερ is obviously the Latin word in Greek characters, and, as obviously, would appear to be not so much a name as a nickname. Sir G. A. Smith (*DB*, 'Antioch') tells us that, in spite of the fact that art and literature were so cultivated as to win the praise of Cicero, yet with the energy and brilliance there was ever mixed a notorious insolence and scurrility. The wit of the place was always famed for giving names.

'The disciples were called Christians first in Antioch' (*Ac* 11<sup>26</sup>), and may it not well be true, though unrecorded, that 'Simon (or Symeon) was called Niger first' in the same city. To call after a 'coloured gentleman' the word Νίγερ ('nigger') would be in keeping with the ribaldry of Antioch—as it would not be unknown at the hands (or voices!) of an ignorant and insolent English crowd! If, then, the name Νίγερ was not given until the bearer of it lived at Antioch, that alone would suffice to explain why Luke, that accurate historian, does not give 'the same designation in both books' (Dr. A. Plummer, *Luke*, 'ICC'). The title Νίγερ, if bestowed at Antioch, is fittingly found in the 'Acts,' but would be an anachronism in the Gospel.

It would thus seem that some, considering Simon of Cyrene to be a Jew, have favoured the idea that he is the same person as 'Symeon, called Niger,' yet, to the knowledge of the writer, no one who has regarded him as 'a native of Africa' has considered the question of identification:

Of course there may be such, and the Johnsonian remark aforementioned may be the reply of readers of wider extent. But to me, at least, the case for the identification is not only made far stronger by the eminently reasonable belief that the Cyrenian was a negro, but one sees the picture, at the cross, of representatives of each of the tripartite divisions of humanity (the 'sons' of Shem, Ham, and Japheth), while at Antioch one may descry a partial fulfilment of the psalmist's 'Ethiopia shall soon stretch forth her hands unto God,' and gain a

prophetic glimpse of the slave races and the oppressed, under the power of Christ, winning further trophies for His name.

Captives—by Thy cross set free,  
Soldiers of that cross, we fight.

*Addendum.*—Since writing the foregoing I have read Professor J. A. Robertson's refreshing and illuminating book, *The Hidden Romance of the New Testament*. The promise of charm and thrill held out by so fascinating a title is not one whit belied by the contents. 'It helps to make the New Testament a more real book to us when we know more intimately some of the people whose lives give the documents body and form,' says the preface. And, further, 'to discover the homelier personal background out of which the New Testament sprang is to relate it more nearly to the life of our day. . . . The most probable theory is that which explains the greatest number of the facts, and is contradicted by none of them.'

It was of peculiar interest to myself to note that Professor Robertson, while not mentioning all the points of the cumulative argument outlined above, has come to the same dual conclusion, viz. that Simon of Cyrene was (not a Jewish settler, but) an African by nationality, and also identical with Symeon called Niger. Concerning the grateful reference to the mother of Rufus, the pertinent question is asked, 'Was it here in Antioch, after Barnabas had fetched Saul from Tarsus, that Rufus' mother mothered him?' 'Simon of Cyrene,' it is added, 'must by and by have returned to Africa, and then crossed the Mediterranean and settled in Rome.' In the course of the book, Professor Robertson naturally describes it as 'somewhat exciting' to discover among the sepulchral inscriptions at Rome, one to 'Epaenetus, an Ephesian,' when the bearer of that name figures, in the last chapter of the Epistle to the Romans, as 'the first in Asia to be reaped for Christ.' Making comparison, not indeed of the *facts*, but of the *emotional effects*, I might well say that to me it is 'exciting' (without any qualifying addition) to find my long-cherished beliefs concerning the Cyrenian shared by so erudite a scholar as the author of *The Hidden Romance of the New Testament*.

Simon of Cyrene a prophet? A member of a slave-race transformed into a leader of the Church of Christ? Impossible? Nay, has not Luke already recorded in his Gospel (18<sup>27</sup>) the words of



the great Transformer, 'The things which are impossible with men are possible with God'? And this special 'impossibility' becomes, by the grace of God, just one of the miracles we may expect, for here is a partial fulfilment of Joel's prophecy,

quoted by Peter on the day of Pentecost, 'Yea, and'—the expression would suggest the climax of Divine surprises—'on my bondmen, and on my bondmaidens, in those days will I pour forth of my Spirit; and they shall prophesy' (Ac 2<sup>18</sup>).

## Contributions and Comments.

### The Life of Schleiermacher.

ON two subjects, Luther and Schleiermacher, there is flowing at all times in Germany a stream of new publications, which has not dried up even during or since the War. To the Schleiermacher literature the most copious contributor has been Professor Mulert of Kiel, who, besides contributing to the *Religionsgeschichtliche Volksbücher* a volume on the subject of the usual size and editing one or two of Schleiermacher's works, including a lovely volume of selections from his Letters, has just commenced a much more formidable task, the completion of his biography.

It will be remembered that Professor Dilthey of Berlin, after editing the *Letters of Schleiermacher* in four volumes, published his *Life* in a single volume, extending to some five or six hundred pages. But this only brought the narrative down to the close of the first Berlin period—that is, to about the year 1800—the rest of the years, to 1834, being still to be written. No book, perhaps, of a biographical kind in the theological world has been so keenly desiderated as the completion of this work. But, although Dilthey lived for forty years after the publication of the first volume, he never managed to publish any more. He would appear, indeed, to have been working at it all the time, with intervals of production, when he composed fragments on certain aspects of his subject, some of which appeared in print, while others accumulated in his desk. On the whole, however, the work was one of the most conspicuous examples of an unfinished task, and Dilthey came in for not a few of the reproaches cast on a man who has begun a work and has not been able to finish it.

Since the death of Dilthey, in 1911, his executors would appear to have been in search of a scholar to complete the work, and the man has been found

in Professor Mulert, who has both the enthusiasm and the perseverance requisite. It will be easily understood, however, that he has undertaken no ordinary task. Evidently it has been the desire of those by whom he has been entrusted with the work that the manuscripts left by Dilthey should be used as much as possible. Accordingly, not only is the first volume republished in a second edition, but in the new portion Dilthey's version is employed wherever this is practicable, two and even three attempts of his being sometimes printed. Dilthey has a reputation as a classical writer, whose very words are entitled to reproduction, and it may be that in the portions of the work still to follow there may be expositions from his pen of the system of Schleiermacher which it is imperative to give in their entirety; but, on the whole, the method is questionable, and it might have been better if Mulert had claimed for himself a freer hand and told the story in his own way.

The present volume only brings the story to the point at which the hero's second Berlin activity commences—that is to say, it covers his residence at Stolpe as a country minister and at Halle as a professor of Theology.

It is usually stated that at Stolpe he was Court-preacher; but it turns out that there was no Court, but only a very ordinary and laborious country-charge, where Schleiermacher was far from happy and saw himself surrounded by religious conditions of a far from satisfactory description. Indeed, his criticism of the spiritual and moral degradation of the people, as well as of their pastors, reminds one of the representations given by Tholuck and other Pietists of the times in which their youth was spent.

The brilliant opening of Schleiermacher's career in Berlin, however, could not be forgotten, and the Prussian authorities, having a vacancy to fill in the

faculty at Halle, bethought them of the exile, and offered him the appointment, which he was only too thankful to accept. Here he began his vast studies in ethics, out of which were ultimately to proceed systems of both philosophical and Christian ethics, and he continued a translation of the *Dialogues* of Plato, which he commenced in collaboration with Friedrich Schlegel, but completed with his own hand, thus keeping his soul alive in the intellectual wilderness of Stolpe, and ultimately giving to his nation a gift similar to that which was bestowed on the English-speaking world by Jowett.

But the town of Halle was included in the Napoleonic invasion, and not only did Schleiermacher see the invader and his generals in the public square, but he had to admit the plundering soldiers into his very room and give up to one of the rascals half a dozen of his shirts. The account of this incident is a most moving one; and, at the present time, it suggests many reflexions on the relations between Germany and France. Napoleon shut the University, and Schleiermacher had to flee to Berlin. The destiny which there awaited him was a great one; for to all Germans Schleiermacher is the greatest religious genius of their race next to Luther; and we heartily wish Professor Mulert success in telling the rest of the story in the volume or volumes still to follow.

*P.S.*—The greatest *lacuna* in translations of foreign theological works into English is, I am gratified to learn on excellent authority, likely to be filled up soon by the publication of a translation of Schleiermacher's *Glaubenslehre*.

JAMES STALKER.

Aberdeen.

## A Volume of Cuneiform Texts.

ON the eve of setting out to establish an American School of Archæology at Bagdad, Professor Albert T. Clay has published another volume of cuneiform texts, this time from the Pierpont-Morgan collection. Its title is *Babylonian Records* (Yale University Press). The Professor is one of the best living copyists of the cuneiform inscriptions, and it is therefore needless to say that the copies are scrupulously accurate. Several of the texts have been published previously, some by Professor Clay himself, others by Professor Scheil, but the earlier

copies have been revised, and important corrections made in them. Among these are revised copies of the Deluge and Adapa tablets, which have already been noticed in THE EXPOSITORY TIMES.

The copies are preceded by an introduction containing transliterations and translations of the inscriptions. These are of a varied character—epical, religious, historical, mathematical and augural, partly in Sumerian, partly in Semitic. There are formulæ for horoscopic forecasts, and dreary lists of omens which had a particular fascination for the Babylonians, as well as syllabaries and a marriage contract. One of the inscriptions is on an onyx bowl, dedicated at the birth of a prince about 5000 years ago. There are also Greek inscriptions on clay sealings and the cover of a jar, the latter of which informs us that 'the other name' of a certain Aristes was the Babylonian Ardiêltheios, 'servant of Beltis,' while one of the sealings relates to 'the public accountant of Erech,' and another mentions 'the salt-duty' levied in that city. An agate cameo intended for the eye of an image bears upon it a dedication to Merodach by Nebuchadrezzar. The texts relating to divination by an examination of the liver will be interesting to students of Etruscan hepatoscopy, which made its way through Asia Minor from Babylonia to Italy.

Most of the tablets come from the library of Erech and belong to the Seleucid period; two of them, in fact, are dated in the sixty-first year of the Seleucid era (251 B.C.), while a third, which is a Sumerian lamentation addressed to 'the Word' of Ellil, is dated in the 108th year of the same era. It is, therefore, obvious that writers in Greek like Berossos were still able to read the old records of the country, and that the native libraries existing there were not only still open but maintained a staff of scribes whose duty it was to copy and re-edit the ancient texts. A study of the changes made in them and of the corruptions they have undergone will be both interesting and important to the critics of the Old Testament. So far as can be seen at present, the editors were conservative and the copyists careful and conscientious.

A. H. SAYCE.

Oxford.

## The Bible and Animals.

(a) IN the earlier documents of the Old Testament there is a sharp distinction between the tame



and the wild animal, between the 'cattle' and the 'beast' of the 'field' or 'jungle' (e.g. Gn 2<sup>20</sup>). An idyllic time was indeed sometimes imagined in the dim past when between even the wild beast and man there was peace (2<sup>19f.</sup> 7<sup>2f.</sup> 14), but the descriptions of this time do not consistently maintain the fiction (3<sup>21</sup>), and it was thought of as ending in far-away days (9<sup>3f.</sup>). The actual fact was enmity (e.g. 37<sup>20</sup>, Jg 14<sup>6</sup>, 1 S 17<sup>34f.</sup>), and a wild beast's only fate was to kill or be killed at sight.

The tame animal, on the other hand, was not only useful to man but even necessary. A patriarch would not have been all that a patriarch should be without his herds (e.g. Gn 24<sup>35</sup>). Still more, when Israel became an agricultural people and her villages were confederacies of farmers, each with his own ancestral plot to till, the ox was the universal partner in his daily work, the ass bore his burdens, while the sheep and goats, feeding in the 'field' beyond the 'sown,' yielded him clothing and milk. To be without these beasts would be the lot of the utterly poor; to possess them was a part of the prosperity of the Hebrew ideal (e.g. Dt 28<sup>4</sup>). The 'domestic animal' was part and parcel of human society.

(b) How were tame animals treated? There is little direct evidence, but almost every indirect hint suggests kindness. Indeed, it would have been foolish to ill-treat such valuable possessions. It is true that the law-books suggest that sometimes the ox or the ass was so overburdened that it sank beside the road—true, too, that the injunction to the passer-by to help the owner to get it up, even though he were an old enemy, aims rather at the relief of the owner than his beast (Ex 23<sup>5</sup>, Dt 22<sup>4</sup>)—but two other statutes suggest that animals were usually well-treated. One of them prescribes the Sabbath rest for the cattle (Ex 20<sup>10</sup>), and the other forbids the muzzle for the threshing ox (Dt 25<sup>4</sup>); neither implies a very rigorous wrong; it is not likely that, if worse practices had been common, they would have escaped censure. Nathan's parable, representing a poor man's one lamb as sharing his home and cup, and as lying in his bosom like a little child (2 S 12<sup>3</sup>), no doubt intentionally portrays an extreme kindness, yet illiterate men who daily tend or work with two or three animals, often make them their intimates, and the ordinary Hebrew ryot would know his oxen as familiarly as many a man knows his friends. While from the

beginning the Hebrew counted it a duty to be kindly to another Hebrew, he only slowly learnt that he ought to be kindly to an alien too,<sup>1</sup> and it may not be without significance that the first great denunciation of cruelty, merely as cruelty, came from a *herdsman*, Amos (Am 1, 2). Had he learnt the lesson among the flocks? The New Testament takes kindness to animals for granted (Mt 12<sup>11</sup>, Lk 13<sup>15</sup> 14<sup>5</sup>).

The mention of a herdsman leads to a principal Old Testament fact. There the 'shepherd' is a favourite Prophetic type of responsibility—especially with Jeremiah, Ezekiel, and Deutero-Isaiah—and it is impossible that an unkindly calling should portray a true king's rule of his people. More, it might typify Jehovah's care for Israel (Ps 23). The Eastern Shepherd—'sleepless, far-sighted, weather-beaten, armed . . . looking out over his scattered sheep, every one of them on his heart,'<sup>2</sup>—could be a type of God. The faithless shepherd is indeed a common figure in Jeremiah and Ezekiel's imagery (e.g. Ezk 34), but then it is his shame to be faithless. Jesus' Parable of the Lost Sheep is here the climax of the Bible. A 'good shepherd layeth down his life for his sheep' (Jn 10<sup>11</sup>). A shepherd could be a type of the Crucified. The Old Testament implication is that, though a domestic animal be but a part of the retinue of men, it is not therefore merely a tool. It has rights. Balaam's ass complained justly (Nu 22<sup>28f.</sup>). God would not wantonly destroy even the 'cattle' (Jon 4<sup>11</sup>). The earliest thought, on the contrary, did not admit any rights to wild beasts (cf. Jg 15<sup>4f.</sup>).

(c) The relation of man to both the tame beast and the wild, led up to the doctrine of his lordship in living nature. The one served him, the other died at his hand. In post-Exilic days the teaching of the Priestly documents (Gn 1<sup>26</sup> 9<sup>2</sup>; cf. Ps 86-8) expressed and 'universalized' these facts; for them, man is God's vicegerent in nature—'Let us make man in our image, after our likeness; and let them have dominion over the fish of the sea, and over the fowl of the air, and over the beasts, and over all the earth, and over every creeping thing that creepeth upon the earth.'

<sup>1</sup> The evidence for this statement, as for others here made about Biblical social phenomena, is laid out in the writer's volume, *The Bible Doctrine of Society in its Historical Evolution* (T. & T. Clark, 1920).

<sup>2</sup> G. A. Smith, *Historical Geography of the Holy Land*, p. 312.

The tame animal, however, had from the first another relation to man—it shared his fate. This is clear if any of the customary vicissitudes of Hebrew village-life—famine, plenty, foray, ‘oppression’—be considered. All involved cattle with man. The only difference was that, while prosperity benefited the beast last, adversity struck it first. The stories that begin and end the Book of Job are here representative. The domestic animals were in a sense one with their owner. The study of the Old Testament phrase ‘man and beast,’ especially in the story of the Plagues of Egypt, gives good illustrations.

But one at least of the principal vicissitudes of agriculture, drought, influenced the wild beast as well as the tame; and, whenever a Prophet taught that a drought was a punishment for man’s sin, he was teaching that all living nature was accursed for man’s sake. Of the plant this is indeed already explicitly stated in the story of Eden (Gn 3<sup>17f.</sup>), but later the beast was added. Hosea and Joel, for instance, have this burden (Hos 4<sup>3</sup>, Jl 1<sup>18</sup>), and after them Zephaniah (1<sup>3</sup>), Jeremiah (7<sup>20</sup> 9<sup>10</sup> 12<sup>4</sup>) and Ezekiel (14<sup>13, 17</sup>). Here, too, a process of generalization went on. Paul drew the teaching to its climax when he made all pain the fruit of sin—‘The whole creation groaneth and travaileth in pain with us until now’ (Ro 8<sup>22</sup>, RV marg.).

But, if drought cursed even the beasts of the field, rain blessed them. And if God’s gifts of rain and plenty waited upon man’s righteousness, it is plain that so far man’s blessing as well as his bane reached the beasts. This fact, too, one Prophet noted (Jl 2<sup>22</sup>; cf. Is 43<sup>20</sup>), but the opinion that the wild animal was man’s natural enemy was too deeply rooted for the notion of their common benefit to become normal. Hosea, indeed, has a hint that there shall come a day when even this ancient enmity shall cease and the harmlessness of Eden be restored (Hos 2<sup>18</sup>; cf. Job 5<sup>23</sup>); but a famous oracle of Isaiah’s makes this the type of the humanly impossible (Is 11<sup>6-9</sup>), and the more usual idea is that in a perfect prosperity the wild beast shall be extinct (*e.g.* Ezk 34<sup>25</sup>, Is 35<sup>9</sup>). The plant world, in contrast, always flourishes in Prophetic prospect with the righteousness of man, for on it his prosperity depends. Paul’s philosophy of the Old Testament (Ro 8<sup>19ff.</sup>), on the other hand, applies more naturally to the animal world.

(d) There was, however, yet another way in

which man was really, though indirectly, related both to the tame and wild beast. When the Hebrew doctrine of God issued in the belief that He was the world’s Creator, it was impossible to deny that He had made animals as well as men. On the contrary, the great account of Creation asserted this and did not hesitate at the corollary that they were all therefore good (Gn 1<sup>24f.</sup>). Further, He who made wild animals cares for them (Gn 1<sup>30</sup>, Ps 104<sup>11, 17ff.</sup>); with them, too, He has a covenant (Gn 9<sup>10</sup>; cf. Ezk 38<sup>20</sup>); even the ravening lion ‘seeks his meat from God’ (Ps 104<sup>21</sup>; cf. 147<sup>9</sup>); Jesus taught that God watches every little bird (Lk 12<sup>6, 24</sup>; cf. Job 38<sup>41</sup>, Ps 50<sup>11</sup>). So that the Hebrew, like all other believers in a universal Providence, fell upon the dilemma that the ‘evil beast’ is good! The only escape seems again to be the postulate that Nature’s fate is bound up with man’s, that even her ferocities are the fruit of his sin, and that with the coming of his perfect righteousness they too will somehow pass and Isaiah’s type of the impossible be realized—‘The lion shall lie down with the lamb.’ The destruction of the wild beast for safety’s sake—and, some would add, that of both wild and tame for food—could on this view be justified only by the principle of accommodation, as a temporary necessity. Nor is it to be forgotten that some at least of the wild animals, both birds, beasts, and insects, have always been really man’s friends even when he did not know it. There would be no grass if there were no worm. On the other side, the story of the Fall (Gn 3<sup>15</sup>), Joel’s prophecy of the locusts, and the narrative of the Plagues of Egypt—to name only three instances—teach that noisome creatures are the discipline and punishment of God. The Bible doctrine of Providence, therefore, unites the animal world, alike in its origin, its history, and its end, with man.

(e) Nothing has been said here of Totemism and Animal Sacrifice. The one may have left traces in the Old Testament, the other is ubiquitous there. The two are related, and both involve in an elementary and inchoate way the union of man and animal. When the persistence of animal sacrifice is remembered, and its prominence in ritual, it is remarkable how slightly the Bible teaching about animals is related to it.

C. RYDER SMITH.

*Richmond College,  
Surrey.*



## Atticism and the New Testament.

In the *Zeitschrift f. d. neuest. Wissenschaft*, Heft 1, 2, 1923, there is an article to which attention may be called—*Der Attizismus und das Neue Testament*, by Lic. Wilhelm Michaelis of Berlin. After an account of this movement to reverse the development of the Greek language, and to bring all literature back to what was deemed Attic purity, the writer raises the question how far this influence can be traced in the variant readings of the MSS. of the New Testament. He then shows that while there are indications that textual critics have recognized this factor, yet it has not been thoroughly explored. He has himself carried out this task for the Synoptic Gospels, but the economic condition of Germany prevents the publication of his results, even in an abbreviated form. This is only one instance of the loss which Biblical scholarship is suffering from the impoverishment of Germany, especially of the cultured middle-class.

ALFRED E. GARVIE.

London.

## Some Suggested Emendations.

MORE than twenty-five years ago I received a visit from a man who asked me to subscribe towards the publication of the Greek text of the New Testament in an edition which he professed to be compiling; he was using, he said, the evidence of the Fathers more than previous editors had done. As far as I know, his edition has never been published. In order to show me the value of his work, he spoke of three passages, in which his text differed from TR or other well-known editions. I believe there was a fourth passage, but I have forgotten it.

The first was Jn 1<sup>13</sup> in which he supported the reading *ὅς . . . ἐγεννήθη* on the authority of early patristic evidence as against *οἱ . . . ἐγεννήθησαν* of the MSS. That there is this variation was already known (*v. Alford*), and it has been much commented on since, but it was new to me then.

His next suggestion was that in Mk 14<sup>41</sup> || Mt 26<sup>45</sup> after Christ's first sentence, *καθεύδετε λοιπὸν καὶ ἀναπαύεσθε*, a question mark should be inserted. *Alford* discussed and rejected the interrogative. *WH* prints a colon. But in the parallel in Lk 22<sup>46</sup> (which is not an exact parallel) the first words are *Τί καθεύδετε*; which would support the interrogative in Mark || Matthew. The translation of Mark would then be, 'Do ye still sleep on and take your rest? it is enough, the hour is come, behold the Son of Man is betrayed into the hands of sinners. Arise, let us be going: behold, he that betrayeth me is at hand.' This certainly gives a plainer meaning than the accepted 'Sleep on now, and take your rest. . . . Arise, let us be going.' It is scarcely necessary to remark that neither colons nor notes of interrogation are in the oldest MSS.

The third was the most interesting of all: in Mt 16<sup>18</sup> my visitor suggested that behind existing MSS was a reading *ΚΥΕΙΠΕ*; which, instead of being expanded into the accepted *ὃν εἶ Πέτρος* should be read *ὃν εἶπας*, 'thou hast said.' As far as I know, this is pure conjecture, but it has its dramatic side in cutting at the root of a text of so much controversial importance. Whether the Papal claims could resist such an attack if it could be substantiated, I must leave to Roman Catholic scholars to determine.

V. T. KIRBY.

Thurgarton Vicarage,  
Nottingham.

## Entre Nous.

### SOME TOPICS.

#### An Animated Compliment.

Mr. F. W. Boreham's latest volume is *Rubble and Roseleaves* (Epworth Press; 5s. net), and a very diverting though instructive companion it will prove for leisure moments. By way of introduction the author says: 'The contents are neither essays nor sermons nor anything of the kind. The

inexhaustible patience of my readers has lured me into the habit of talking on any mortal—or immortal—subject that takes my fancy. I have merely set down here a few wayward notions that have, in the course of my wanderings, occurred to me. But, in self-defence, let me add that these outbursts have been punctuated by whole infinitudes of silence. The silences are eloquently represented by the gaps between the chapters.'

We quote one of his stories, with the moral he draws from it. 'When fishermen on the Dogger Bank speak of the old days and the old ways, they remind each other that, years ago, each fishing-boat was fitted with a tank or well, constructed with perforated sides so that the water it contained was part and parcel of the sea through which the boat was sailing. Into these wells the fish were transferred from the nets immediately upon their arrival from the deep. In this new environment the graceful creatures gave no evidence of discontent or resentment. They would live indefinitely in their floating homes. But the fishermen found that . . . the fish in the wells waxed limp and listless. They lost their flavour and sweetness. This, according to the tradition, happened to all the fishing-boats save one.

'One fisherman, and one only, brought his fish to market in excellent condition. He landed them at Billingsgate as healthy and brisk and firm as though he had caught them ten minutes earlier under London Bridge. The dealers soon learned to distinguish between the fish from his boat and the fish from all the others. His fish brought the highest prices on the market, and the happy fisherman rejoiced in his abounding prosperity. His comrades marvelled at his success and vainly endeavoured to cajole his secret from him. He was not to be drawn. The matter remained an inscrutable mystery until the day of the old fisherman's death. Then, acting upon her father's instructions, his daughter unfolded the secret. Her father, she said, made it a rule to keep a catfish in the well of his boat. The catfish kept the other fish in a ferment of agitation and alarm. They were never at rest. And, because a catfish compelled them to live in the well under conditions that were approximately normal, they came to market in as wholesome a state as though they had just been dragged from the deep.

'I often take myself into a quiet corner and . . . repeat to myself the famous tradition of the catfish. I find myself at times in a rebellious mood. Why is life so troubled, so agitated, so disturbed? If only I could be left alone! Why may I not fold my hands and be quiet? I am hunted up hill and down dale; I am driven from pillar to post. I have to work for my living—an irksome necessity. I often have to go out when I would rather stay in, and have to stay in when I would rather go out. I am the prey of antagonisms of many kinds. Life

is full of irritations, annoyances, mortifications, and disappointments. I am not my own master. Like Paul, *I find a law that, when I would do good, evil is present with me; the good that I would I do not, and the evil which I would not that I do.* Paul found it extremely exasperating, and so do I. If only I could live without work and without worry and without any of my present vexations! Why, oh why, must there always be a catfish in my well?

'A catfish is an animated compliment. . . . It is because the fisherman values his fish that he puts the catfish into the well to annoy them.'

#### A Temperance Campaign in China.

'He even dares to give his humour vent when dealing with his superiors. Recently, in the celebration of General Wu Peifu's birthday, General Feng sent him a large wine-jar full of distilled water, with a homily urging General Wu to inaugurate a temperance campaign among his soldiers. The *North China Herald*, commenting on this incident, remarked: "We are sure the gift reflects equal honour on the giver and the recipient. General Feng is an uncommon man, but if he were not sure that his friend would accept his present in the spirit in which he sent it, we may be sure he would have preferred something more conventional; for it is ill jesting with a man who has fifty thousand armed men at his back."

This paragraph is taken from an account of the Chinese Christian general who has been much before the public lately. The title of the book is *General Feng: A Good Soldier of Christ Jesus* (China Inland Mission; 1s. net).

#### 'Stir up the Gift'—an Illustration.

'I venture to affirm, also, that another proportion of our bodily infirmities is due entirely to our ignorance of the amount of vital force which is stored within us. A genuine illness comes, and instead of summoning the forces which are latent in the frailest, we accept the situation and, by and by, perhaps are listed with the chronic invalids. You will not readily forget the illustration of the converse side of this supplied to us here so eloquently by "Vining of Canada." The scene was a lumber camp, with its herculean toilers, its women caring for the workers in the tents, and the children playing round. A cry told that a log, rolling down, had thrown a child and pinned it to the earth.



The child's mother heard and saw, and, running up, stooped and lifted the massive piece of timber from her darling's limbs. When it was all over it took three men to do, in their normal state, what that mother had been enabled to do by the excitement of her love. I am far from suggesting that all chronic invalidism is due to the fact that latent power is not fully utilized, but the instances are countless of the marvellous things which, when the circumstances called for them, the world's chronic invalids have done.' <sup>1</sup>

### The Power of Imagination.

'In his autobiography, Major George H. Putnam gives an illustration of this law. "Frothingham related to me an incident which his father had told him in regard to the beginning of the Channingite Movement. In response to an appeal issued by Mr. Channing, the ministers of the Congregational Churches of Boston, who were in sympathy with his protest, had come together to formulate a programme. The hour for the meeting came, but the leader had not appeared. Nathaniel Frothingham, as his nearest neighbour, was sent to Channing's house to ascertain the difficulty. He found the divine wrapped up in flannels and with his feet in a tub of hot water.

'Ah! Brother Frothingham,' said Channing, 'I am sadly disappointed to be a delinquent, but my friends will have to get on without me. I am disabled with an attack of neuralgia. This bitter east wind has been too much for me.' 'East wind!' replied Frothingham, 'why, the wind is from the south-west, and the air is balmy and warm.' Channing looked out sadly through his window to a neighbouring vane, which, surely enough, as pointed, marked the wind from the east. 'Oh, Brother Channing,' said Frothingham, 'that vane is untrustworthy; it is on a Baptist Chapel and it has, in some way, become fixed.' The instant that Channing learned that the wind was not from the east his neuralgia disappeared. He threw off his flannels, got into his boots, and hurrying down to the church on the arm of his friend, he opened the meeting with an address that became famous in the history of the intellectual life and the theological development of New England, and of the country at large.' <sup>2</sup>

<sup>1</sup> J. M. Logan, *Christian Science*, 10.

<sup>2</sup> *Ibid.* 9 f.

### The Ministry of Women.

'There is yet another region of experiment, not part of the specific programme of any one of the three dominating schools in the Church of England, but one of great importance, which excites strong feeling. It is the use which should be made of the ministry of women. There are here two main questions, permission to preach and access to the priesthood. The first, apart from prejudice, is surely simple. The right to deliver a sermon in a church should depend on three things, ability to preach, which is a gift, a licence from the Bishop, and an invitation from the incumbent. Any one who is a Christian, and can preach the Gospel to the spiritual and intellectual advantage of the hearers, ought to be allowed, and encouraged, to do so. Some can preach, and some cannot. Some want to preach, and some do not. If any person wants to preach and can preach, the sex of the person does not seem to make any difference. A competent lay-woman should be licensed by the Bishop on precisely the same terms as competent laymen are sometimes licensed now. It is natural and reasonable that the sermon in a church should ordinarily be preached by those clergymen who have the cure of souls in the parish. But priest and prophet are not identical terms. If help that will be really useful is forthcoming from any quarter, why should it not be used?' <sup>3</sup>

### The Appeal of the Babe.

'Christmas comes to us again with its word of peace, and the mystery of the holy birth deepens. . . . I want to tell you of something that happened last Friday afternoon. The Christian women came to my house that day for half an hour, which we spend in prayer for the women of the world. . . . They held out imploring hands to Christ, saying, "Make our black bodies shine for thee, Jesus our Chief. We are only black women. Thou art the great Chief of the white men, yet we too can love thee." I tried to tell them that he was a *brown* baby, not white like us or black like them; and that he was a helpless baby needing a mother's love and care; that thus he came to us, the great Chief. Was it foolish to tell them that? They so hate their black bodies, and I fear it is our fault that they do. One woman took her baby off her back, held him towards me, and said, "Small and

<sup>3</sup> S. C. Carpenter, *A Large Room*, 182 f.



weak like this? Did a woman bear him and feed him?" "Yes," I said. They clapped their hands and shouted their equivalent to "All hail, Baby Chief!" They had never realized all this before. "We thought he was a white woman's baby," said one, which simply meant that he was ours, not theirs.<sup>1</sup>

### The Universal Appeal.

'The apostles of Jesus have travelled the world over making him known, with strange results. The Jesus of the Western missionary was, naturally, "the lean and strenuous personality" of the Western ideal. He lived the common life. He was active, practical, constructive. He laid emphasis upon a resolute and fruitful repentance and rectitude of life. The teaching was based upon the Gospels and was true. But (e.g.) in India there emerges a Jesus of long silence and patience and serenity, of a forty days' fast and retreat, of long nights spent in solitary contemplation among the lonely hills, of a mystic vision of life, of wandering days, and of a detached interior life amid a crowd of men. The "oriental Jesus" was found in the Gospels and was true. Montefiore and Zangwill find an Israelitish Jesus; China is finding a Chinese Jesus; Africa will find an African Jesus; he compels consciousness of kinship everywhere. But every local Jesus is an incomplete Jesus, for there is no schism in his nature, he is one and undivided, he is all mankind—and all womankind—the centre and uniting link of our racial unity.

'As he travels from continent to continent his mind becomes the final mind. He silently forms the ideal public opinion, social and moral. Those who bear his name are judged with accuracy by his standards. For in him are found blended and balanced and perfected all those elements of character which are instinctively recognized to be the truly human. We mean all this when we say of Jesus that he is *the Son of Man*.'<sup>2</sup>

### NEW POETRY.

#### Nettie Rooker.

*The Streets of Nazareth* (R.T.S.; 2s. 6d. net) is a small collection of the poems of Nettie Rooker. The book is published posthumously by her sister,

<sup>1</sup> A. H. Small, *The Kingdom and the King*, 108.

<sup>2</sup> *Ibid.* 77 f.

who says, in a short preface: 'My sister was highly strung, and suffered all her life from overtaking her strength in earlier years in Rescue Work. She passed through times of severe depression, and knew what sorrow meant. . . . But her courage was great, and she possessed a brightness of disposition which, with a keen sense of humour, saved her from morbidity. Her delight in Nature was intense, and so was her love of children.' Of the poem which gives its title to the collection and which we quote, she remarks: 'It was an unexpected pleasure to me to hear "The Streets of Nazareth" sung by the children in the C.M.S. school at Nazareth; and it gave my sister great satisfaction when I told her of it.'

#### THE STREETS OF NAZARETH.

When I am tempted to repine  
That such a lowly lot is mine,  
There comes to me a voice which saith,  
'Mine were the streets of Nazareth.'

So mean, so common and confined,  
And *He* the Monarch of mankind!  
Yet patiently He travelleth  
Those narrow streets of Nazareth.

It may be I shall never rise  
To place or fame beneath the skies—  
But walk in straitened ways till death,  
Narrow as streets of Nazareth.

But *if* thro' honour's arch I tread  
And there forget to bend my head,  
Ah! let me hear the voice which saith,  
'*Mine* were the streets of Nazareth.'

#### James D. Gaff.

Another volume which has been published posthumously is *The Dark Mysterious Way* (Erskine Macdonald; 5s. net), by James D. Gaff. The preface says: 'The Poems contained in this volume are a selection from many, written between the years of 1860 and 1892, by a doctor in general practice, whom thwarting adversity and a life of weary struggle, of hard and conscientious work for grudging and scanty remuneration, denied the realization of every poet's ardent wish, the delivery of his message and his thoughts to mankind. He died in 1922 in his eighty-fourth year.' Dr. Gaff



had many interests, so there is considerable variety in the volume. The following three verses are from 'Purge Ye.'

But purge ye, oh purge ye and quick,  
Make an end of this meaningless wrong :  
The world need not always be sick,  
The poor need not crowd in a throng.

'Tis a lie ! in the name of God,  
'Tis a lie—of lies the worst,  
That a foot must walk unshod,  
That a man should beg for a crust.

Ye say ye are brothers by birth,  
Ye say ye are brothers in Christ ;—  
Yet ye shut me out from the earth,  
And the waters I drink are priced.

Edwin Essex, O.P.

#### THE NIGHT OF FOREKNOWING.

When Christ lay in the manger  
And men slept in the inn,  
He knew they slept as softly  
As if there were no sin.

His secret wrapt Him closely  
As any swaddling-band,  
And Joseph, even Mary,  
Not yet could understand.

He knew He was a King then  
To wear a plaited crown,  
He had a reed for sceptre  
And men were bowing down.

He looked into the twilight  
And men were sleeping sound  
Within a little Garden,  
And Blood was on the ground.

His Hands so soft and tiny  
Were lifted to the sky,  
Both were red as any rose,  
A rose that cannot die.

He found a Hill in darkness  
With crosses set for three,  
Forsaken was the hill-top  
And God was far to see.

But albeit as softly  
As if there were no sin,  
When Christ lay in the manger  
Men slumbered at the inn.

#### PRAYER.

'When you pray, speak not much.'  
'Not much'—if not at all,  
Will He then come  
To hearts that cannot call,  
Lips that are dumb ?

Aye, for our silent cries  
And hearts of fear  
Shall pierce the roofing skies  
And draw Him near.

These are two songs of a priest, taken from a little volume with the simple title, *Poems*, by Edwin Essex, O.P. (G. Macdonald ; 3s. 6d. net). Although the title is plain it is a dangerous one, but here it is justified.

J. M. Stuart-Young.

Would Mr. Stuart-Young find himself in agreement with the critic who recently described 'The Rosary' as 'the world's worst song'? Perhaps not. For Mr. Stuart-Young, who is himself a professional song-writer, believes that the gifted amateur is often more successful than the professional.

Mr. Stuart-Young is not averse to sentiment. But he does object to the popular idea that "any old thing" will serve to make a song about—for the people! And he has written two volumes of lyrics to provide composers with something worthier. The volumes are published at ros. 6d. each by Cecil Palmer, London. Their titles are—*Minor Melodies*, and *Who Buys My Dreams*?

Printed by MORRISON & GIBB LIMITED, Tanfield Works, and published by T. & T. CLARK, 38 George Street, Edinburgh. It is requested that all literary communications be addressed to THE EDITOR, Kings Gate, Aberdeen, Scotland.